



Informazioni su questo libro

Si tratta della copia digitale di un libro che per generazioni è stato conservata negli scaffali di una biblioteca prima di essere digitalizzato da Google nell'ambito del progetto volto a rendere disponibili online i libri di tutto il mondo.

Ha sopravvissuto abbastanza per non essere più protetto dai diritti di copyright e diventare di pubblico dominio. Un libro di pubblico dominio è un libro che non è mai stato protetto dal copyright o i cui termini legali di copyright sono scaduti. La classificazione di un libro come di pubblico dominio può variare da paese a paese. I libri di pubblico dominio sono l'anello di congiunzione con il passato, rappresentano un patrimonio storico, culturale e di conoscenza spesso difficile da scoprire.

Commenti, note e altre annotazioni a margine presenti nel volume originale compariranno in questo file, come testimonianza del lungo viaggio percorso dal libro, dall'editore originale alla biblioteca, per giungere fino a te.

Linee guida per l'utilizzo

Google è orgoglioso di essere il partner delle biblioteche per digitalizzare i materiali di pubblico dominio e renderli universalmente disponibili. I libri di pubblico dominio appartengono al pubblico e noi ne siamo solamente i custodi. Tuttavia questo lavoro è oneroso, pertanto, per poter continuare ad offrire questo servizio abbiamo preso alcune iniziative per impedire l'utilizzo illecito da parte di soggetti commerciali, compresa l'imposizione di restrizioni sull'invio di query automatizzate.

Inoltre ti chiediamo di:

- + *Non fare un uso commerciale di questi file* Abbiamo concepito Google Ricerca Libri per l'uso da parte dei singoli utenti privati e ti chiediamo di utilizzare questi file per uso personale e non a fini commerciali.
- + *Non inviare query automatizzate* Non inviare a Google query automatizzate di alcun tipo. Se stai effettuando delle ricerche nel campo della traduzione automatica, del riconoscimento ottico dei caratteri (OCR) o in altri campi dove necessiti di utilizzare grandi quantità di testo, ti invitiamo a contattarci. Incoraggiamo l'uso dei materiali di pubblico dominio per questi scopi e potremmo esserti di aiuto.
- + *Conserva la filigrana* La "filigrana" (watermark) di Google che compare in ciascun file è essenziale per informare gli utenti su questo progetto e aiutarli a trovare materiali aggiuntivi tramite Google Ricerca Libri. Non rimuoverla.
- + *Fanne un uso legale* Indipendentemente dall'utilizzo che ne farai, ricordati che è tua responsabilità accertarti di farne un uso legale. Non dare per scontato che, poiché un libro è di pubblico dominio per gli utenti degli Stati Uniti, sia di pubblico dominio anche per gli utenti di altri paesi. I criteri che stabiliscono se un libro è protetto da copyright variano da Paese a Paese e non possiamo offrire indicazioni se un determinato uso del libro è consentito. Non dare per scontato che poiché un libro compare in Google Ricerca Libri ciò significhi che può essere utilizzato in qualsiasi modo e in qualsiasi Paese del mondo. Le sanzioni per le violazioni del copyright possono essere molto severe.


Informazioni su Google Ricerca Libri

La missione di Google è organizzare le informazioni a livello mondiale e renderle universalmente accessibili e fruibili. Google Ricerca Libri aiuta i lettori a scoprire i libri di tutto il mondo e consente ad autori ed editori di raggiungere un pubblico più ampio. Puoi effettuare una ricerca sul Web nell'intero testo di questo libro da <http://books.google.com>

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



St. gr. a.
1505 rb

Monro
(Homerus)

<36633658880018

S

<36633658880018

Bayer. Staatsbibliothek

Clarendon Press Series

HOMERIC GRAMMAR

D. B. MONRO

London
HENRY FROWDE



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.

Clarendon Press Series

A GRAMMAR

OF THE

HOMERIC DIALECT

BY

D. B. MONRO, M.A.

PROVOST OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD

SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED

L'objet de cette science est de rechercher dans l'esprit de l'homme
la cause de la transformation des idiomes


M. BRÉAL

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1891

[*All rights reserved*]



Oxford

PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

BY HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY

OF THE REV.

JAMES RIDDELL

LATE FELLOW AND TUTOR OF BALLIOL

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

It may be said, without fear of giving offence, that a new Grammar of the Homeric dialect is sorely wanted. The admirable *Griechische Formenlehre* of the late H. L. Ahrens is now just thirty years old, and is confined, as its title indicates, to the inflexions. Not only has the course of discovery been going on since Ahrens wrote (and with hardly less rapidity than in the first years of the new science), but the historical method has been carried into the field of syntax. And apart from 'comparative philology,' the researches of Bekker, Cobet, La Roche, and many other students have brought together a wealth of material that only needs careful analysis and arrangement to make it accessible to the general body of learners.

The plan of this book has sufficient novelty to call for some explanation. I have not attempted to write a Comparative Grammar, or even a Grammar that would deserve the epithet 'historical:' but I have kept in view two principles of arrangement which belong to the historical or genetic method. These are, that grammar should proceed from the simple to the complex types of the Sentence, and that the form and the meaning should as far as possible be treated together. Now the simplest possible Sentence—apart from mere exclamations—consists of a *Verb*, or word containing in itself the two elements of all rational utterance, a Subject and a Predicate. We begin, therefore, by analysing the Verb, and classifying (1) the Endings, which express the Person and Number of the Subject (§§ 1-7), and serve also to distinguish the 'Middle' or Reflexive use (§ 8), and (2) the modifications of the Stem which yield the several Tenses and Moods. These modifications, we at once perceive, are more numerous than the meanings which they serve to express, and we have therefore to

choose between classifying according to *formation*—i. e. according to the process by which each Tense-Stem and Mood-Stem is derived from the simple Verb-Stem or Root,—and the ordinary classification according to meaning (Present, Future, Perfect, Aorist, &c.). The former course seemed preferable because it answers to the historical order. The problem is to find how pre-existing forms—common to Greek and Sanscrit, and therefore part of an original ‘Indo-European’ grammar—were adapted to the specifically Greek system of Tense-meanings. I have therefore taken the different formations in turn, beginning with the simplest (§§ 9–20, 22–27, 29–69, 79–83), and introducing an account of the meaning of each as soon as possible (§§ 21, 28, 70–78). This part of the subject naturally includes the accentuation of the different forms of the Verb (§§ 87–89).

The next great division of the subject is concerned with the first enlargement of the Sentence. A word may be added which taken by itself says nothing—contains no Subject and Predicate—but which combines with and qualifies the primitive one-word Sentence. The elements which may gather in this way round the basis or nucleus formed by the Verb are ultimately of two kinds, Nouns and Pronouns; and the relations in which they may stand to the Verb are also two-fold. A Noun or Pronoun may stand as a Subject—limiting or explaining the Subject already contained in the Person-Ending—or may qualify the Predicate given by the Stem of the Verb. These relations are shown by the Ending, which again may be either a Case-Ending or an adverbial Ending. We begin accordingly by an account of the *Declensions*, supplemented by a list of the chief groups of *Adverbs* (Chapter V).

When we pass from the Endings to the Stems of Nouns and Pronouns, we find that they are essentially different. A ‘Nominal Stem’ consists in general of two parts, (1) a *predicative* part, usually identical with a Verb-Stem, and (2) a Suffix. Each of these two elements, again, may be complex. The addition of a further Suffix yields a fresh Stem, with a corresponding derivative meaning; and thus we have the distinction between *Primitive* or Verbal and *Secondary* or Denominative Nouns. The Suffixes employed in these two

classes are generally distinct, and deserve a more careful enumeration than is usually given in elementary grammars. The predicative part, again, may be enlarged by a second Nominal Stem, prefixed to the other, and qualifying it nearly as a Case-form or Adverb qualifies the Verb. The Compounds thus formed are of especial interest for the poetical dialect of Homer. The analysis which I have given of the chief forms which they present must be taken to be provisional only, as the subject is still full of doubt. With respect to the meaning I have attempted no complete classification. It is always unsafe to insist on distinctions which may be clear to us, but only because we mark them by distinct forms of expression.

The chapter on the formation of Nouns should perhaps have been followed by one on the formation of Pronouns. The material for such a chapter, however, lies for the most part beyond the scope of a grammar. It is represented in this book by a section on Heteroclite Pronouns (§ 108), which notices some traces of composite Pronominal Stems, and in some degree by another on the Numerals (§ 130).

When we come to examine the syntactical use of the Cases, we find ourselves sometimes dealing with sentences which contain at least two members besides the Verb. Along with the constructions which may be called 'adverbial' (using the term *Adverb* in a wide sense, to include all words directly construed with the Verb), we have the constructions in which the governing word is a Noun or Preposition. And in these again we must distinguish between the government of a Case *apparently* by a Noun or Preposition, really by the combined result of the Noun or Preposition and the Verb, and the true government by a Noun alone, of which the dependent Genitive and the Adjective are the main types. These distinctions, however, though of great importance in reference to the development of the use of Cases, cannot well be followed exclusively in the order of treatment. I have therefore taken the Cases in succession, and along with them the chief points which have to be noticed regarding the 'concord' of Gender (§§ 166-168) and Number (§§ 169-173).

In the Infinitive and Participle (Chapter X) we have the first step from the simple to the complex Sentence. The pre-

dicative element in the Verbal Noun is treated syntactically like the same element in a true or 'finite' Verb; that is to say, it takes 'adverbial' constructions. Thus while retaining the character of a Noun it becomes the nucleus of a new imperfect Sentence, without a grammatical Subject properly so called (though the Infinitive in Greek acquired a quasi-Subject in the use of the Accusative before it), and standing to the main Sentence as an adverb or adjective.

While the Infinitival and Participial Clauses may thus be described as Nouns which have expanded into dependent Sentences, the true Subordinate Clause shows the opposite process. In many instances, especially in Homeric syntax, we can trace the steps by which originally independent Sentences have come to stand in an adverbial or adjectival relation. The change is generally brought about, as we shall see, by means of Pronouns, or Adverbs formed from Pronominal stems. Hence it is convenient that the account of the uses of the Pronouns (Chapter XI) should hold the place of an introduction to the part in which we have to do with the relations of Clauses to each other.

The next chapter, however, does not treat directly of subordinate Clauses, but of the uses of the Moods in them. It seemed best to bring these uses into immediate connexion with the uses which are found in simple Sentences. In this way the original character of Subordinate Clauses comes into a clearer light. If anything remains to be said of them, it finds its place in the account of the Particles (Chapter XIII); in which also we examine the relations of independent Sentences, so far at least as these are expressed by grammatical forms.

The last chapter contains a discussion of the Metre of Homer (Chapter XIV), and of some points of 'phonology' which (for us at least) are ultimately metrical questions. Chief among these is the famous question of the Digamma. I have endeavoured to state the main issues which have been raised on this subject as fully as possible: but without much hope of bringing them to a satisfactory decision.

A book of this kind is necessarily to a great extent a compilation, and from sources so numerous that it is scarcely possible to make a sufficient acknowledgment of indebted-

ness. The earlier chapters are mainly founded on the great work of G. Curtius on the Greek Verb. More recent writers have cleared up some difficulties, especially in the phonology. I have learned very much from M. de Saussure's *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles*, and from several articles by K. Brugmann and Joh. Schmidt, especially the last. I would mention also, as valuable on single points, the papers of J. Paech (Vratisl. 1861) and H. Stier (*Curt. Stud.* II) on the Subjunctive, B. Mangold on the 'diectasis' of Verbs in *-áω* (*Curt. Stud.* VI), F. D. Allen on the same subject (*Trans. of the American Phil. Assoc.* 1873), Leskien on *σσ* in the Fut. and Aor. (*Curt. Stud.* II), and K. Koch on the Augment (Brunsvici 1868). On the subject of Nominal Composition I may name a paper by W. Clemm in *Curt. Stud.* VII, which gives references to the earlier literature of the subject, and one by F. Stolz (Klagenfurt 1874). On the forms of the Personal Pronouns there is a valuable dissertation by P. Cauer (*Curt. Stud.* VII): on the Numerals by Joh. Baunack (*K. Z.* XXV): on the Comparative and Superlative by Fr. Weihrich (*De Gradibus*, &c. Gissae 1869). Going on to the syntax of the Cases, I would place first the dissertation of B. Delbrück, *Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis*, &c. (Berlin 1867), and next the excellent work of Hübschmann, *Zur Casuslehre* (München 1875). On the Accusative I have obtained the greatest help from La Roche, *Der Accusativ im Homer* (Wien 1861): on the Dual from Bieber, *De Duali Numero* (Jena 1864). On the Prepositions I have used the papers of C. A. J. Hoffmann (Lüneburg 1857-60, Clausthal 1858-59), T. Mommsen (see § 221), Giseke, *Die allmälliche Entstehung der Gesänge der Ilias* (Göttingen 1853), La Roche, especially on *ὑπό* (Wien 1861) and *ἐν* (in the *Z. f. öst. Gymn.*), Rau on *παρά* (*Curt. Stud.* III), and the articles in Ebeling's *Lexicon*. On this part of syntax the fourth volume of Delbrück's *Forschungen* is especially instructive. Of the literature on the Infinitive I would mention J. Jolly's *Geschichte des Infinitivs im Indogermanischen* (München 1873), also a paper by Albrecht (*Curt. Stud.* IV), and a note in Max Müller's *Chips from a German Workshop* (IV. p. 49 ff.). The use of the Participle has been admirably treated by Classen, in his *Beobachtungen über den homerischen Sprachgebrauch*

(Frankfurt 1867). A paper by Jolly in the collection of *Sprachwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen* (Leipzig 1874) is also suggestive. On the subject of the Pronouns the chief source is a dissertation by E. Windisch in *Curt. Stud.* II. On the Article almost everything will be found in H. Foerstemann's *Bemerkungen über den Gebrauch des Artikels bei Homer* (Magdeburg 1861). The controversy on the Reflexive Pronoun is referred to in § 255. On the Homeric uses of the Moods, besides Delbrück's great work, I would mention Jolly's monograph entitled *Ein Kapitel vergleichender Syntax* (München 1872), and L. Lange's elaborate papers on $\epsilon\iota$ (Leipzig 1872-73). It is to be regretted that they have not yet been carried to the point of forming a complete book on the Homeric use of $\epsilon\iota$. For the general theory of the subject Prof. Goodwin's *Greek Moods and Tenses* is of the very highest value. Regarding the cognate question of the uses of $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ and $\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$ the main principles have been laid down by Delbrück. It is worth while to mention that they were clearly stated as long ago as 1832, in a paper in the Philological Museum (Vol. I. p. 96), written in opposition to the then reigning method of Hermann. For the other Particles little has been done by Homeric students since Nägelsbach and Hartung. I have cited three valuable papers; on $\tau\epsilon$ by Wentzel, on η ($\eta\epsilon$) by Praetorius, and on $\mu\eta$ by A. R. Vierke. I would add here a paper on the syntax of Causal Sentences in Homer, by E. Pfudel (Liegnitz 1871). On all syntactical matters use has been made of the abundant stores of Kühner's *Ausführliche Grammatik*. And it is impossible to say too much of the guidance and inspiration (as I may almost call it) which I have derived from the *Digest of Platonic Idioms* left behind by the lamented friend to whose memory I have ventured to dedicate this book.

On the collateral subjects of Metre I have profited most by Hartel's *Homerische Studien*, La Roche, *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Leipzig 1869), Knös, *De digammo Homericō* (Upsaliae 1872-79), and Tudeer, *De dialectorum Graecarum digammo* (Helsingforsiae 1879).

OXFORD, July 18, 1882.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE rapid progress of linguistic science during the nine years that have passed since this Grammar was first published has necessitated considerable alteration and enlargement in a new edition. Much has been discovered in the interval; much that was then new and speculative has been accepted on all sides; and much has been done in sifting and combining the results attained. The *Morphologischen Untersuchungen* of Osthoff and Brugmann have been followed by Brugmann's admirable summary of Greek grammar (in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*), and his comprehensive *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Of three portions of this work that have already appeared (Strassburg 1886-90-91), the last (treating chiefly of the Declensions) came too late to be of service to the present book. The part which deals with the Verb has not yet been published: and the volume on Comparative Syntax, promised by Delbrück—the first complete work on this part of the subject—is also still to come. It will doubtless be a worthy sequel to the *Altindische Syntax*, which now forms the fifth volume of his *Syntaktische Forschungen*. Among other books which have appeared since the publication of this Grammar, or which were not sufficiently made use of for the first edition, I would mention Joh. Schmidt's *Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra* (Weimar 1889), G. Meyer's *Griechische Grammatik* (second edition, Leipzig 1886), the new edition of Mr. Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses* (London 1889), the treatises in Schanz's series of *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*, Aug. Fick's two books (see Appendix F), articles by Wackernagel, Fröhde and others in *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* and *Bezenberger's Beiträge*, the long series of papers by Aug.

Nauck collected in the *Mélanges gréco-romains* (St. Petersburg 1855-88)—a book not often seen in this country,—and the dissertations of J. van Leeuwen in the *Mnemosyne*. The two writers last mentioned are chiefly concerned with the restoration of the Homeric text to its original or pre-historic form. Their method, which is philological rather than linguistic, may lead to some further results when the numerous MSS. of the *Iliad* have been examined and have furnished us with an adequate *apparatus criticus*.

Although very much has been re-written, the numbering of the sections has been retained, with a few exceptions; so that the references made to the first edition will generally still hold good. The new sections are distinguished by an asterisk.

I will not attempt to enumerate the points on which new matter has been added, or former views recalled or modified. The increase in the size of the book is largely due to the fuller treatment of the morphology. Additions bearing on questions of syntax will be found in §§ 238, 248, 267, 270*, 362, 365. On the whole I have become more sceptical about the theories which seek to explain the forms of the Subordinate Clause from parataxis, or the mere juxta-position of independent clauses. In general it may be admitted that the complex arose in the first instance by the amalgamation of simpler elements: but we must beware of leaving out of sight the effect of 'contamination' in extending syntactical types once created. The neglect of this consideration is in reality another and more insidious form of the error from which recent writers on morphology have delivered us, viz. that of explaining grammatical forms as the result of direct amalgamation of a stem with a suffix or ending, without duly allowing for the working of analogy.

OXFORD, *March* 21, 1891.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.



CHAPTER I. The Person-Endings.

	PAGE
§ 1. Sentences—Subject and Predicate	I
2. Stem and Endings	I
3. The Person-Endings	I
4. Thematic Vowel—Non-Thematic forms	2
5. Table of Person-Endings	2
6. Influence of the Ending on the Stem	6
7. The forms of the 3 Plural	8
8. Meaning of the Middle	9

CHAPTER II. The Tenses.

9. Verb-Stem—Tense-Stem	10
10. Formation of Tense-Stems	11
11. The Simple Non-Thematic Present	12
12. Variation of the Stem—Examples	12
13. The Simple Non-Thematic Aorist	14
14. Metathesis	15
15. Aorists in -ᾱ and -κᾱ	16
16. The Non-Thematic Reduplicated Present	17
17. The Presents with -vῆ (-vᾱ) and -vu	18
18. Thematic forms	18
19. Non-Thematic Contracted Verbs—Presents	20
20. " " " Aorists	22
21. Meaning of Non-Thematic Tenses	22
22. The Perfect	22
23. Reduplication	26
24. The forms of the 3 Plural	27
25. Long and Short Stems	28
26. The Perfect Participle	28
27. Thematic forms	30
28. Meaning of the Perfect	31
29. The Simple Thematic Present	32
30. With Short Stem	33
31. The Thematic Aorist	34
32. Remarks	36
33. Doubtful forms	37
34. Thematic Aorists in Homer	38

	PAGE
35. The Reduplicated Thematic Present	39
36. The Reduplicated Aorist (Thematic)	39
37. Aorists in - α	40
38. Tense-Stems formed by a Suffix	40
39. The Aorist in - $\sigma\alpha$	40
40. Aorists with Suffix - σ -	42
41. The Aorist in - $\sigma\epsilon$, - $\sigma\omicron$ (Thematic)	43
42. Passive Aorists—the Aor. in - $\eta\upsilon$	44
43. " " " $\theta\eta\upsilon$	44
44. Meaning of the Passive Aorists	44
45. Suffixes of the Present-Stem	45
46. T-Class (- $\tau\epsilon$, - $\tau\omicron$)	46
47. Nasal Class (- $\nu\epsilon$, - $\nu\omicron$, &c.)	46
48. Iterative Class (- $\sigma\kappa\epsilon$, - $\sigma\kappa\omicron$)	47
49. Iterative Tenses	47
50. I-Class (- $\iota\epsilon$, - $\iota\omicron$)	48
51. Verbs in - $\iota\omega$, &c.	48
52. Epenthesis	49
53. Assimilation of ι	49
54. Compensatory lengthening	50
55. Verbs in - $\alpha\omega$, - $\epsilon\omega$, - $\omicron\omega$ —Assimilation	50
56. Contraction	54
57. Synizesis	55
58. Meaning of Verbs of the I-Class	56
59. Desideratives	56
60. Frequentatives	56
61. Intensives	56
62. Collateral forms of the Present in Homer	56
63. The Future in - $\sigma\omega$	57
64. The Future in - $\sigma\epsilon\omega$	58
65. Futures from Perfect and Aorist Stems	59
66. Future Middle	59
67. The Augment (Historical Tenses)	60
68. The Pluperfect	61
69. Loss of Augment	62
70. Meaning of the Present and Aorist Stems	62
71. Present-Stem—Relative progress	63
72. Essentially progressive action	64
73. Past process (the Imperfect)	64
74. Descriptive Imperfect	64
75. Aorist-Stem	65
76. Aorist of the immediate past	65
77. Aorist Participle (coincidence)	66
78. Aorist of present time :	66
Aor. in Similes—gnomic Aor.	67

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xvii

CHAPTER III. The Moods.

	PAGE
79. The Moods—Infinitive and Participle . . .	67
80. The Subjunctive—Non-Thematic Tense-Stems . . .	68
81. Contraction	69
82. Thematic Tense-Stems	70
83. The Optative	72
84. The Verbal Nouns	73
85. The Infinitive	74
86. The Participle	75

CHAPTER IV. Accentuation of the Verb.

87. General rule of accentuation of Verbs . . .	75
88. Accent in Composition	76
89. The Infinitive and Participle	77

CHAPTER V. Nouns and Pronouns.

90. Nominal and Pronominal Stems	78
91. Declensions	78
92. The Vocative	79
93. The Case-Endings	79
94. Stems in -t, -v and -σ	80
95. Stems in -ā	81
96. Cases—The Nominative Singular	81
97. The Accusative Singular	82
98. The Genitive Singular	83
99. The Dative Singular	83
99*. Plural	84
100. The Accusative Plural	84
101. The Genitive Plural	85
102. The Dative Plural	85
103. The Dual	86
104. The Instrumental in -ϕ(v)	86
105. Contraction, Synizesis, Hyphaeresis	87
106. Variation of the Stem	88
107. Heteroclite Nouns	90
108. Heteroclite Pronouns	92
109. Adverbial Endings	93
110. Case-forms as Adverbs	94
111. Accentuation of Nouns	97
112. The Vocative	98

CHAPTER VI. Formation of Nouns.

113. Nominal Stems—Primary and Secondary	99
114. Primary Suffixes	100
114*. Variation of Suffixes	104
115. Accentuation	107
116. Gender	108

b

	PAGE
117. Secondary Suffixes	110
118. Compound Suffixes	111
118*. Suffixes of different periods	111
119. Gender	112
120. Denominative Verbs	113
121. Comparison of Adjectives	114
122. Meaning of Comparatives and Superlatives	116
123. Composition	116
124. Form of the Prefixed Stem	117
125. Form of the Second Stem	120
126. Meaning of Compounds	122
127. Stems compounded with Prepositions	123
128. Accentuation of Compounds	124
129. Proper Names	124
130. Numerals	125

CHAPTER VII. Use of the Cases.

131. Relation of Nouns and Pronouns to the Verb	127
132. The Accusative—Internal and External Object	128
133. Neuter Pronouns	129
134. Neuter Adjectives	129
135. Cognate Accusatives	129
136. Other Adverbial Accusatives	130
137. Accusative of the part affected	131
138. „ of Time and Space	132
139. „ with Nouns	132
140. „ of the External Object	133
141. Double Accusatives	134
142. The Dative	135
143. The 'true' Dative	135
144. The Instrumental Dative	137
145. The Locative Dative	139
146. The Genitive	140
147. The Genitive with Nouns	141
148. „ „ in the Predicate	142
149. „ „ of Place	143
150. „ „ of Time	143
151. The quasi-Partitive Genitive	144
152. The Ablative Genitive	147
153. The Genitive of Price	148
154. The Case-Ending -φ(v)	148
155. Instrumental	149
156. Ablative	149
157. Locative	150
158. Dative and Genitive	150
159. Forms in -θεν and -ως—The Ending -θεν	151
160. The Ending -ως	152

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xix

	PAGE
161. The Nominative—Impersonal Verbs	152
162. Nominative in the Predicate	153
163. Interjectional Nominative	155
164. The Vocative	155
165. Substantive and Adjective	156
166. Gender of Adjectives	157
167. „ Pronouns	158
168. Implied Predication	158

CHAPTER VIII. Use of the Numbers.

169. Collective Nouns	158
170. Distributive use of the Singular	159
171. Plural of Things	160
172. Neuter Plural with Singular Verb	160
173. The Dual	161

CHAPTER IX. The Prepositions.

174. Definition	163
175. Adverbial use of Prepositions	163
176. Tmesis	163
177. Ellipse of the Verb	164
178. Use with Oblique Cases	165
179. Use with the Genitive	166
180. Accentuation—'Anastrophe' of Prepositions	166
180*. Apocope	169
181. ἀμφί	170
182. ἀμφί with the Dative	171
183. „ „ Accusative	171
184. „ „ Genitive	172
185. περί	172
186. περί with the Dative	173
187. „ „ Accusative	174
188. „ „ Genitive	174
189. παρά	175
190. παρά with the Dative	175
191. „ „ Accusative	176
192. „ „ Genitive	176
193. μετά	177
194. μετά with the Dative	177
195. „ „ Accusative	178
196. „ „ Genitive	178
197. ἐνί	179
198. ἐνί with the Dative	179
199. „ „ Accusative	180
200. „ „ Genitive	181

	PAGE
201. <i>ὅπό</i>	181
202. <i>ὅπό</i> with the Dative	182
203. „ „ Accusative	182
204. „ „ Genitive	183
205. <i>πρὸς</i> (<i>πρός</i>), <i>πρὶ</i>	184
206. <i>πρὸς</i> with the Dative	184
207. „ „ Accusative	184
208. „ „ Genitive	184
209. <i>ἀνά</i> —with the Dat.—with the Gen.	185
210. <i>ἀνά</i> with the Accusative	185
211. <i>κατά</i>	186
212. <i>κατά</i> with the Accusative	186
213. „ „ Genitive	187
214. <i>διὰ</i>	187
215. <i>διὰ</i> with the Accusative	187
216. „ „ Genitive	188
217. <i>ἐν</i>	188
218. <i>ἐν</i> with the Accusative	188
219. „ „ Genitive	188
220. <i>ἐνί</i> (<i>ἐν</i>)	189
221. <i>σύν</i> , <i>ξύν</i>	189
222. <i>ἐς</i>	190
223. <i>ἐξ</i>	190
224. <i>ἀπό</i>	191
225. <i>πρό</i>	191
226. <i>ἀντί</i>	192
227. Double Prepositions	192
228. Improper Prepositions	193
229. Homeric and Attic uses	194

CHAPTER X. The Verbal Nouns.

230. Nature of the Verbal Nouns	195
231. The Infinitive—original meaning	196
232. Infinitive with Nouns	198
233. „ with Impersonal Verbs	198
234. „ as the Subject	199
235. „ with Relatives	201
236. „ with <i>πρὶν</i> and <i>πᾶρος</i>	201
237. Accusative with the Infinitive	201
238. Tenses of the Infinitive	203
239. Dative with the Infinitive	204
240. Predicative Nouns—Attraction	204
241. Infinitive used as an Imperative	206
242. Origin and History of the Infinitive	207

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xxi

	PAGE
243. The Participle—uses	209
244. Tenses of the Participle	211
245. Implied Predication	212
246. The Genitive Absolute	212
246*. The Verbal Adjectives	214

CHAPTER XI. Use of Pronouns.

247. Subordinate Clauses—Deictic and Anaphoric Pronouns	215
248. Interrogative Pronouns	215
249. ὅδε, τοσόσδε, τοιόσδε, ὧδε, ἐνθάδε	216
250. κεῖνος	217
251. οὗτος	217
252. αὐτός, αὐτῶς	218
253. The Reflexive Pronoun	219
254. The Possessive ἐός, ὅς	220
255. ἐός, ὅς as a general Reflexive	221
256. The Article	224
257. The Substantival Article	224
258. The Attributive „	226
259. With connecting Particles	227
260. With Adjectives	228
261. The defining Article	229
262. The Article as a Relative	231
263. The Article with τε	232
264. Homeric and Attic use of the Article	232
265. ὅς ἢ ὅ	234
266. ὅς τε, ὅς τις	235
267. Correlative Clauses	236
268. οὐνεκα	240
269. ὅ, ὅτι, ὅ τε	241
270. ὅ, ὅτι, ὅ τε as Conjunctions	244
270*. Indirect Discourse	245
271. Form of the Relative Clause	245
272. Double Relative Clauses	247

CHAPTER XII. Use of the Moods.

273. Classification of Sentences	248
274. The Subjunctive in Principal Clauses	251
275. Affirmative	251
276. Negative	253
277. Interrogative	253
278. Prohibitive	254
279. Homeric and Attic uses	255
280. The Subjunctive in Subordinate Clauses—Clauses with ἥέ—ἥε	255
281. Clauses with μή	256
282. Relative Clauses—Final	257
283. „ „ Conditional	258

	PAGE
284. Relational Adverbs	260
285. ὡς, ὅπως	260
286. ἵνα	261
287. ὅφρα	262
288. ὥς, εἰς ὅ	262
289. ὅτε, ὅποτε	263
290. εὔτε, ἥμος	265
291. Clauses with εἰ, &c.	265
292. Conditional Protasis	265
293. Final Clauses with εἰ	267
294. Object Clauses with εἰ	267
295. The Subjunctive with ὡς εἰ	268
296. ἐπεὶ with the Subj.	268
297. πρὶν „ „	269
298. The Subjunctive after Secondary Tenses	270
299. The Optative in Simple Sentences	271
300. With κεν or ἄν	273
301. The Optative in Subordinate Clauses	275
302. Clauses with ἥέ—ἥε	275
303. Clauses with μή	276
304. Relative Clauses—Final and Object	276
305. „ „ Conditional	278
306. Relational Adverbs—ὡς, ὅπως, ἵνα	279
307. ὥς, ὅφρα	281
308. ὅτε, ὅποτε	282
309. ἐπεὶ	283
310. πρὶν	283
311. εἰ—Conditional Protasis	284
312. εἰ—Optative of Wish	285
313. εἰ κεν—Conditional Protasis	285
314. εἰ—Final and Object Clauses	286
315. History of the Subjunctive and Optative—	
Uses in Independent Clauses	287
316. „ Subordinate Clauses	287
317. Original meaning	289
318. Conditional Protasis with εἰ	290
319. Final Clauses with εἰ	291
320. εἰ δ' ἄγε	291
321. Conclusion	292
322. Homeric and Attic Uses	293
323. The Indicative—Modal Uses	293
324. Conditional Apodosis	294
324*. Ellipse of the Apodosis	295
325. Past Tense by Assimilation	296
326. Future Indicative	296
327. The Imperative	298
328. Prohibition	299

xxiii

CHAPTER XIII. The Particles.

	PAGE
329. Classification of the Particles	299
330. καί	300
331. τε	301
332. τε in general statement	301
333. δέ	304
334. δέ of the Apodosis	305
335. Enclitic δέ	307
336-7. ἀλλά, αὐτάρ, ἀτάρ, αὖ, αὖτε, ἔμψης	308
338. ἤ	308
339. τίη, ἐπειή	309
340. ἦέ, ἦ	310
341. Dependent Interrogative	311
342-5. μάν, μήν, μέν	312
346. τοι	315
347-8. ἄρα, γάρ	316
349-352. οὖν, δή, νυ, θην	319
353. περ	320
354. γε	321
355. οὐ, μή—distinction of usage	322
356. οὐδέ, μηδέ, οὐδέις	323
357. Double negatives	323
358. Uses of μή—Indicative	324
359. οὐ and μή in Conditional Clauses	325
360. οὐ with the Infinitive and Participle	326
361. μή " " " "	326
362. κεν and ἄν	327
363. Summary of uses—difference of ἄν and κεν	331
364. Original meaning of ἄν and κεν	334
365. Order of Particles and Enclitic Pronouns	335


CHAPTER XIV. Metre and Quantity.

366.	The Hexameter	338
	367. Diaeresis and Caesura	338
	368. Spondaic verses	340
369.	Quantity of Syllables	341
	370. Position	342
	371. Lengthening before ρ , λ , μ , ν , σ , δ	344
	372. Origin of the lengthening	345
	373. Final -t of the Dat. Sing.	346
	374. Final -a of the Neut. Plur.	347
	375. Short Syllables ending in a Consonant	347
376.	Elision, &c.	349
	377. Crasis	350
	378. Synizesis	351
	378*. Contraction	351

	PAGE
379. Hiatus	355
380. Long vowels before Hiatus	355
381. Shortening of diphthongs before Hiatus	356
382. Hiatus after short syllables	357
383. Doubtful Syllables	357
384. Doubtful vowels	358
385. Doubling of consonants	360
386. Metrical licence	360
387. Vocatives	360
388. The Digamma	361
389. Nature of the evidence from metre	361
390. Words with initial <i>f</i>	363
391. Words with initial <i>σf</i> (<i>f</i>)	370
392. <i>f</i> inferred from metre only	371
393. Loss of <i>f</i> , esp. before <i>ο</i> , <i>ω</i>	372
394-5. Initial <i>δf</i> , <i>fρ</i> , &c.	374
396. <i>f</i> not initial	375
397. Loss of initial <i>σ</i> and <i>ι</i>	376
398. Traces of <i>f</i> —Summary	376
399. Theories of the Digamma	376
400. Hypothesis of alternative forms	377
401. Explanation from fixed phrases, &c.	377
402. Hiatus, &c., as a survival	378
403. Explanation from the nature of the <i>f</i>	379
404-5. <i>f</i> in other Greek dialects—in Ionic	379
APPENDIX C. On <i>η</i> and <i>ει</i> in Homer	384
F. Fick's theory of the Homeric dialect	386
Other Notes and Corrections ,	396
INDEX I.—Homeric Forms	403
II.—Subjects	424
III.—Chief passages referred to	431

ERRATA.

Page 70, line 6, for <i>γνῶς</i> read <i>γνῶς</i>
" 83, " 23, for <i>κρηδέντος</i> read <i>κρυδέντος</i>
" 93, " 30, for <i>θήρηθι</i> read <i>θύρηθι</i>
" 149, " 38, before 18. 305 insert II.
" 185, " 1, for II. read Od.
" 223, " 32, for <i>olos</i> read <i>olos</i>
" 245, " 36, for three read two, and dele 16. 131.,
" 259, " 12, for governing read governing
" 309, " 12, for 22. 280 read 16. 61
" 329, " 10, for <i>φίλην</i> read <i>φίλον</i>



HOMERIC GRAMMAR.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.—THE PERSON-ENDINGS.

1.] ALL language of which grammar takes cognisance consists of SENTENCES. The simplest complete Sentence expresses the combination of a SUBJECT—that about which we speak (or think); and a PREDICATE—that which we say (or think) about the Subject. On the sentences which are (apparently or really) without a Subject, see §§ 161, 163.

2.] In Greek (and generally in languages whose structure resembles that of Greek) every Verb is a complete Sentence, consisting of two parts, the *Stem*, which expresses the Predicate, and the *Ending*, which expresses the Subject. Thus $\xi\sigma\text{-}\tau\iota$ *he* (or *it*) *is*, $\phi\alpha\text{-}\theta\iota$ *say thou*, $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$ *we came*, are Sentences; the several Predicates are expressed by the Stems $\xi\sigma\text{-}$, $\phi\alpha\text{-}$, $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\text{-}$, and the Subjects by the Endings $\text{-}\tau\iota$, $\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$. As the Endings of a Verb may always be translated by Personal Pronouns they are called the *Person-Endings*.

It may happen that the ending has been lost by phonetic corruption, as in $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon$ (for $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\text{-}\tau$) *he took*. This however does not form a real exception, because in Greek such words are used exactly as if the lost ending were still sounded. In English it is different: *took* can only be used to express a Predicate. The original Subject is lost to the mind as well as to the ear.

It should be noticed that the term 'Verb' is used in Grammars with a double meaning, sometimes of a single form—as when we say that $\epsilon\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omicron\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$ is 'a Verb'—sometimes collectively, as when we say that $\epsilon\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omicron\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$ is a 'part' of 'the Verb $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omega$.' Here 'a Verb' means a group of forms, derived from a common root.

3.] There are three main sets of Person-Endings :—

1. Those used in the Tenses called 'Principal' (the Present, Perfect, and Future Indicative), and in the Subjunctive; these are called the *Primary Endings*.

2. Those used in the 'Historical Tenses' (the Imperfect, Aorist, and Pluperfect), and in the Optative; these are called the *Secondary Endings*.

3. The Endings of the Imperative.

4.] The further modifications which the Endings undergo depend chiefly upon the final letter of the Stem.

In certain forms the Ending is preceded by **O** or **E**: that is to say, **O** before the nasals μ , ν , and **E** before other letters; e.g. $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\text{O}-\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\text{E}-\tau\epsilon$, $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\text{O}-\nu\tau\iota$ (older and Dor. form of $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$). We shall call this the *Thematic Vowel*,* and the Stems which contain it *Thematic Stems*. The term will naturally include the corresponding Subjunctives, in which the final letter of the Stem varies in the same way between η and ω , as $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omega-\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\eta-\tau\epsilon$, &c. and the 1 Sing. in $-\omega$. These long vowels doubtless represent a primitive contraction of the Thematic vowel with some other element: but the exact process can hardly be determined.

The forms which do not contain this variable ϵ or \omicron are called *Non-Thematic*. Among these, again, we have to distinguish a group of Tenses with Stems ending in $-\tilde{\alpha}$, viz. the Perfect, the First Aorist, and some forms peculiar to the Ionic Dialect, as the Plpf. (e.g. $\eta\delta\epsilon\alpha$ I knew), the Impf. $\eta\alpha$ I was, $\eta\iota\alpha$ I went. In these Stems the $-\tilde{\alpha}$ changes in the 3 Sing. to $-(\nu)^{\dagger}$.

The distinction between Thematic and Non-Thematic applies in strictness only to forms, but may generally be extended to Tenses and Moods. Thus the Pres. and Impf. of $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omega$ are Thematic, the same Tenses of $\phi\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$ are Non-Thematic. In every Verb the Future is Thematic, the Optative is Non-Thematic, &c. But the distinction does not apply to 'Verbs' (in the collective sense of the term), because almost every Verb is made up of forms of both kinds.

5.] In the following Table of the Person-Endings found in Homer the Endings distinguished by larger type are those of the Non-Thematic Tenses. The Endings in smaller type are, first, those of the forms with $-\tilde{\alpha}$, and, under them again, those of the Thematic forms. In the Dual and Plural (except the 3 Plur.) the Endings are the same throughout.

* This vowel has also been termed the 'Connecting' or 'Auxiliary' Vowel—names given on the supposition that it is originally euphonic, inserted in order to allow the Stem and the Ending to be distinctly heard in pronunciation. The name 'Thematic' implies a different theory, viz. that it serves to form a 'Theme' from a simpler element or 'Root,' as $\lambda\epsilon\gamma-\epsilon$ from the Root $\lambda\epsilon\gamma-$; see Curt. Chron. p. 40. On this theory the Stem $\lambda\epsilon\gamma-\epsilon$, $\lambda\epsilon\gamma-\omicron$ is originally the same as the Theme or Stem of the Noun $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron-s$. See the remarks of Brugmann, *Grundriss*, ii. § 8, n. 1.

In the former edition the $-\omega$ of the 1 Sing. was explained as $-\omicron-\mu\iota$ (Sanskrit $-\tilde{a}-mi$). It is now generally thought that $-\omega$ and $-\mu\iota$ are originally distinct, and represent respectively the Thematic and Non-Thematic Endings of the primitive Indo-European Verb. If so, the Sanscrit $-\tilde{a}mi$ has extended from the Non-Thematic to the Thematic conjugation; and similarly the $-\omicron\mu\iota$ of Greek $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\mu\iota$ (Sanskrit $bh\ddot{a}re$). See Meyer, *G. G.* p. 404.

† The $\tilde{\alpha}$ of these Stems is of course quite different from the final vowel of the Stem in such forms as $\phi\alpha-\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, $\iota\sigma\tau\alpha-\mu\iota$, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\alpha-\theta\iota$, where it is part of the Verb-Stem or 'Root.'

	PRIMARY.		SECONDARY.		IMPERATIVE.	
	ACT.	MID.	ACT.	MID.	ACT.	MID.
1 Sing.	-μι -ᾶ -ω, Subj. -ω, -ωμι -σι, -ς, -σθα -ᾶς -εις, S. -ης -τι(ν), -σι(ν) -ε(ν) -ει, S. -η, -ησι	-μαι -ομαι, S. -ωμαι -σαι, -αι -εαι, S. -ηαι -ται -εται, S. -ηται -μεθον -σθον -σθον -μεσθα, -μεθα -σθε -νται, -ᾶται -ονται, S. -ωνται	-ν -ᾶ -ον -ς -ᾶς -ες -(τ) -ε(ν) -ε(ν) -τον -την, -τον -μεν -τε -ν, -σαν -ᾶν -ον	-μην ᾶ-μην -όμεν -σο, -ο -ᾶο -εο -το -ᾶτο -ετο -σθον -σθην -μεσθα, -μεθα -σθε -ντο, -ᾶτο -αυτο -οντο	— — — -θι, -ς -σο, -ο -ον -εις, -ες -τω -ᾶτω -έτω — -τον -των — -τε -ντων -ᾶντων -όντων	— — — — -εο — — -σθω -ᾶσθω -έσθω — -σθον -σθων — -σθε -σθων -ᾶσθων -έσθων
2 Sing.						
3 Sing.						
1 Dual						
2 ...						
3 ...						
1 Plur.						
2 ...						
3 ...						

Remarks on the Table of Person-Endings.

1 Sing. On the Subj. in *-ω-μι* see § 82, and on the Optatives which take *-μι* in the 1 Sing. see § 83.

2 Sing. The original *-σι* remains only in *ἔσ-σί* *thou art*.

The form *εἰς* (or enclitic *εἰς*) is read in nine places, but there is only one (Od. 17. 388) in which the metre does not allow *ἔσσ'* to be read instead. Probably, therefore, *ἔσσι* is the genuine Homeric form. The Attic *εἶ* is not found in Homer.

The Ending *-σθα* occurs in the Pf. *οἶσθα* *thou knowest* (*οἶδας* in Od. 1. 337, is a very doubtful reading), Plpf. *ᾔδησθα* (Od. 19. 93), the Impf. *ᾔσθα* and *ἔησθα* *thou wast*, *ἔφησθα* *thou saidst*, and the Pres. *εἶσθα* *thou wilt go*, *τίθηςθα* (Od. 9. 404., 24. 476), *διδόειςθα* (Il. 19. 270), perhaps *φῆηςθα* (Od. 14. 149): also in some Subjunctives, *ἐθέλῃσθα*, *εἴπῃσθα*, *βουλεύῃσθα* (Il. 9. 99), *ἴησθα* (Il. 10. 67); and in the Optatives *βάλῃσθα* (Il. 15. 571), *κλαῖῃσθα* (Il. 24. 619), and *προφύγῃσθα* (Od. 22. 325).

The history of this *-σθα* can still be traced. Originally *-θα* (Sanscr. *-tha*) was the Ending of the 2 Sing. Pf. Ind.: hence *οἶσθα* for *οἶδ-θα* (Sanscr. *vettha* for *ved-tha*), and *ᾔσ-θα* (Sanscr. *āsitha*) properly Pf. from the root *ἔσ-*. Having in these cases appeared accidentally as an ending *-σθα*, it was transferred in this form to other Tenses and Moods.*

The forms *ᾔσθας*, *οἶσθας* which appear in some MSS are due to the common 2 Sing. in *-ας*. Aristarchus rejected them in Homer.

In the Middle the *σ* of *-σαι*, *-σο* when it follows a vowel is generally lost: so always in the Secondary Tenses, as *ἐμάρνα-ο*, *δαίνυ-ο*, *ἔσσυ-ο*, *λείσα-ο*, contracted *ἐκρέμω* (Il. 15. 18), *ἐπεφράσω* (Il. 21. 410), *ἐκτήσω* (Od. 24. 193)—for which, however, the metre allows us to write *ἐκρέμα'*, &c.—and the Opt. *-οι-ο*. In the Pres. and Pf. Indic. and the Imper. the usage is not uniform: *δύνα-σαι* (Il. 1. 393), *ὄνο-σαι* (Od. 17. 378), *παρ-ίστα-σαι* (Il. 10. 279., Od. 17. 450), *ὑπο-δάμνα-σαι* (Od. 16. 95), *δαίνυ-σαι* (Od. 21. 290), *μέμνη-σαι* (Il. 23. 648), Imper. *ἵστα-σο* (seven times), *διη-σο* (Od. 19. 68), *κεῖ-σο* (Il. 21. 122): but *μέμνη-αι* (Il. 21. 442), *μέμνη* (Il. 15. 18, where we may read *μέμνη'*), *βέβληαι* (three places in the Iliad), *δίλῃ-αι* (Od. 11. 100), Imper. *θέ-ο* (Od. 10. 333), *φά-ο* (Od. 18. 171), *μάρνα-ο* (Il. 15. 475), *παρ-ίστα-ο* (Il. 10. 291, according to Aristarchus, *παρ-ίστα-σο* MSS.).

The loss of *σ* was in accordance with Greek phonetic law, and originally universal; but new forms in *-σαι*, *-σο* were produced on the analogy of forms such as *λέξο* (for *λεχ-σο*), *ῆσο* (for *ἡσ-σο*), *πέπυσσαι* (for *πεπυθ-σαι*), *τέτυξο*, &c., in which the *σ* is preserved by the preceding consonant.

Verbs in *-εω*, which would properly form *-εσαι*, *-εσο*, sometimes

* On this point recent writers have gone back to the explanation given by Bopp, *Vergl. Gr.* II. pp. 292, 498.

suffer Hypphaeresis (cp. § 105, 4), and drop one ε; as *μύθειαι* (Od. 2. 202), *ἀπο-αίρεο*, *ἐκλεο*. But we find also *μυθεῖαι* (Od. 8. 180), *νεῖαι* (Od. 11. 114., 12. 141)—where it is possible to substitute the uncontracted *μυθέαι*, *νέαι*—and *αἰδεῖο* (Il. 24. 503).

In the Imper. the Ending -θι is common in Non-Thematic Tenses: *ἴ-θι*, *σπῆ-θι*, *κλῦ-θι*, *κέκλυ-θι*, *ἔστα-θι*, *ῥρνυ-θι*, *φάνη-θι* (Il. 18. 198), *δίδω-θι* (Od. 3. 380), *ἐμπίπλη-θι* (Il. 23. 311). We find -s in *θές-s*, *δός-s*, *πρόε-s* (*προ-ίημι*), and the thematic *ἐνί-σπεε-s tell* (cp. Attic *σχέ-s*).

In the forms *ἴσθη* (Il. 21. 313), *δαίνῃ* (Il. 9. 70), *δείκνῃ* (Hes. Th. 526), the long final vowel probably comes by analogy from the Pres. and Impf. Singular forms (by the 'proportion' Impf. *ἔλεγε-s*, *ἔλεγε*: Imper. *λέγε*: *ἴσθης*, *ἴσθη*: *ἴσθη*). For the forms *καθ-ίστα*, *τίθει*, *δίδου*, &c., see § 18.

3 Sing. The original -τι remains only in *ἔσ-τι(ν)*, in which the phonetic change of -τι to -σι is prevented by the preceding σ.

On the Subjunctives in -η-σι see § 82.

3 Plur. The Ending -ᾶσι (for -αντι) is found in *ἔ-ᾶσι* (for **ἔσ-ασι*) *they are* and *ἴ-ᾶσι* *they go*.

Stems in α, ε, ο, υ form -ᾶσι, -εῖσι, -ουσι, -ῶσι (for -αντι, &c.), as *φασί*, *ιστᾶσι*, *τιθεῖσι*, *διδούσι*, *ζευγνύσι* (not *τιθέ-ασι*, &c., as in Attic). On the accent of these forms, see § 87, 2.

The Perfect Act. has -ᾶσι and -ᾷσι. The latter occurs only twice in Homer, *πεφύκ-ᾷσι* (Od. 7. 114), *λελόγχᾳσιν* (Od. 11. 304); for other examples in Ionic see Curt. *Verb.* ii. 166. In these forms the ᾷ belongs to the Ending, since -ᾷσι is for -ᾳτι, which corresponds to the -ντι of the Doric *φα-ντί*, *λέγο-ντι* (as -ᾳται in the Mid. to -νται). The forms with -ᾶσι belong to two essentially distinct groups; see § 7.

The secondary -ᾶν (for -αντ) is found in all Aorists which form the 1 Sing. in -ᾶ. It may also be traced in the Impf. of *εἰμί*, in the form *ῆν* (Hes. Th. 321, 825), for *ῆαν* (Sanscr. *āsan*).

Non-Thematic -ν occurs in the forms *ἔφᾶ-ν*, *ἔβᾶ-ν*, *ἔστᾶ-ν*, *φθᾶ-ν*, *ἔδῶ-ν* (Il. 11. 263), *ἔφῶ-ν* (Od. 10. 397), *ἔκᾶ-ν*, Impf. *ἔε-ν* (in *ξύν-ιεν*, *μέθ-ιεν*), *πρό-τιθε-ν* (read by Aristarchus in Od. 1. 112), *ἔδιδο-ν* (H. Cer. 327), and many Passive Aorists, as *ἔβλαβε-ν*, *δι-έτμαγε-ν*, *ἄγε-ν*, *ἄλε-ν*, *δάμε-ν*, *πάγε-ν*, *ἡγερθε-ν*, *κόσμηθε-ν*, *κατ-έκταθε-ν*. On the form *μῖάνθην* (Il. 4. 146) see § 40. In these tenses -ν is commoner in Homer than -σαν. But -σαν is the only Ending found in the two Imperfects *ῆ-σαν* and *ῆῖ-σαν*, *ἴ-σαν*, and in the Pluperfect: see § 68.

In the Middle, the forms -ᾳται, -ᾳτο are regular after consonants and the vowel ι (including the diphthongs ει, ηι, ου, &c.); the forms -νται, -ντο after ᾶ, ε, ο. After υ, η both forms are found: e.g. *εἰρύ-атаι*, *εἰρύ-ατο*, but *λέλυ-νται*, *κέχυ-νται*; *βεβλή-атаι* (Il. 11. 656), but *μέμνη-ντο*, *ξύμβλη-ντο*; even *ῆντο* (Il. 3. 153) as well as *ῆ-ατο* (for **ῆσ-ατο*).

The Imper. Endings *-τῶσαν, -σθῶσαν* are post-Homeric.

1 Dual. *-μεθον* occurs only once, in *περιδῶμεθον*, Il. 23. 485. Elmsley (on Ar. Ach. 733) maintained that this form was a fiction of the grammarians. It is defended by G. Curtius (*Verb. I.* 97 f.), and there seems no valid reason for rejecting it.

2 and 3 Dual. In the Historical Tenses, according to the ancient grammarians, the regular Endings are—

2 Dual Act. *-τον, Mid. -σθον.*

3 „ „ *-την, „ -σθην.*

This scheme, however, is open to some doubt; for—

(1) Homer has three instances of the 3 Dual Impf. in *-τον*, where the metre does not admit of *-την*, viz. *διώκε-τον* (Il. 10. 363), *ἐτεύχε-τον* (Il. 13. 345), *λαφύσσε-τον* (Il. 18. 583). Three others in *-σθον* occur as various readings, where the metre admits of either *-σθον* or *-σθην*, viz. *ἀφίκε-σθον*, read by some ancient critics (probably Zenodotus) in Il. 13. 613: *θωρήσσε-σθον*, the reading of A. (the Cod. Venetus) and Eust. in Il. 16. 218: *πέτε-σθον*, a marginal variant of A. in Il. 23. 506.

(2) Three forms of the 2 Dual in *-την* were read in the text of Zenodotus, viz. *καμέ-την* (Il. 8. 448), *λάβε-την* (Il. 10. 545), *ἠθέλε-την* (Il. 11. 782). Aristarchus read *κάμε-τον, λάβε-τον, ἠθέλε-τον*. The metre gives no help to a decision.

(3) In Attic the examples of the 2 Dual in *-την, -σθην* are so common that Elmsley (on Ar. Ach. 733) held these to be the only correct forms, thus making the Dual of Historical Tenses uniformly end in *-ην*, as the Dual of the Principal Tenses ends in *-ον*. Cobet maintains the same view (*Misc. Crit.* pp. 279 ff.). But the account of the Greek grammarians is strikingly borne out by the forms of the Sanscrit Dual. In Sanscrit we find that in the Historical Tenses the 2 Dual ends in *-tam*, 3 Dual in *-tām*, answering perfectly to the Greek *-τον, -την*. This therefore is to be regarded as the original rule. The exceptions which have been quoted are evidently due to the tendency towards uniformity: and it is to be noticed that this tendency seems to have acted in Homer in the direction of making all Duals end in *-τον, -σθον*, whereas in Attic the tendency was to extend the Endings *-την, -σθην* to the Second Person.

The Imper. Ending *-των* is found in *ἔστων* (Il. 1. 338) and *κομείτων* (Il. 8. 109). As to *ἔστων* in Od. 1. 273, where it is usually taken as a Plural, see § 173.

Variation of the Stem.

6.] In Thematic Stems it is plain that the Ending influences only the final *ε(ο)*, leaving the rest of the Stem unaffected. Non-Thematic forms, on the other hand, are liable to variations in *quantity* which affect the main vowel of the Stem. These variations are governed by the general rule that *when there are two forms of a Stem the longer is found with the Endings of the*

Sing. Indic. Act., the shorter with all other Endings, viz. those of the Dual and Plural, the Imperative, and the Middle. Thus:—

(1) *ᾱ*, *ε*, *ο* interchange with the corresponding long vowels *ᾱ* (in Ionic *η*), *η*, *ω*; as *φη-μί*, *ἔ-φη-ν*, but *ι* Plur. *φᾶ-μέν*, Imper. *φᾶ-θί*, Mid. *ἔ-φα-το*; *τίθη-μι*, Mid. *τίθε-μαι*; *δίδω-μι*, Mid. *δίδο-μαι*.

(2) *ι* with *ει* and *οι*: as *εἶ-μι*, *ι* Plur. *ἱ-μεν*, Imper. *ἱ-θι*; *οἶδα*, *ι* Plur. *ἰδ-μεν*.

(3) *υ* with *ευ* and *υ*: as *ἔ-χευα*, Mid. *χύ-το* (§ 15); *δείκνυ-μι*, *ι* Plur. *δείκνυ-μεν*. Sometimes with *ου*, as *εἰλήλουθα*, stem *ἐλῦθ-*.

Note however that all vowels are liable to be shortened before the combination *ντ*, as in the 3 Plur. *ἔστ᾿ν* (but *ἔστη-μεν*), &c., and the Participle, *στάντ-ος*, *γόνντ-ος*. Also before *ι* of the Optative, *σταίην*, *γνοίην*.

The same law governs the interchange of—

(4) *ᾱ* with *εν* and *ον*: as *γέγονα* (*γένος*), *ι* Plur. *γέγα-μεν*; *πέπouθα* (*πένθ-ος*), Part. Fem. *πεπᾶθ-υῖα*.*

(5) *ᾱρ* with *ερ* and *ορ*: as *ἔφθορα*, Mid. *ἔφθαρ-ται* (Pres. *φθείρω* for *φθερ-ιω*); and, with Metathesis (*ρα* for *αρ*, &c.), *τέρροφε*, Mid. *τέθραπ-ται* (*τρέφ-ω*).*

The combinations *ᾱρ(ρᾱ)* and *ᾱλ(λᾱ)* represent the primitive 'liquid vowels,' *ῥ* and *λ*. They appear in place of the consonantal *ρ* and *λ* when these are phonetically impossible: e.g. *ἔφθαρται* is for *ἔφθρ-ται*,—the *ερ* of the root *φθερ-* passing into *αρ* where Sanser. *ar* would pass into *ῥ*.

Similarly, *ᾱ* represents the 'nasal vowels' *ῃ* and *ῆ*: thus *πᾶθ-* is for *πνθ-*. Before another vowel *εμ*, *εν* sometimes pass into *ᾱμ*, *ᾱν*, as in *ἔκτανον* for *ἔ-κτυ-ον* (root *κτεν-*), in the same way that *υ* and *ι* before a vowel may appear as *uv*, *iy*.

Sometimes the longer Stem contains an additional consonant, viz. in the Perfects and Aorists in *-κα*, as *ἔστηκα*, *ι* Plur. *ἔστᾶ-μεν*; *ἔθηκα*, *ι* Plur. *ἔθε-μεν*.

These are the principal variations which can be exemplified within the limits of a single Tense. When we compare one Tense with another, we observe further the interchange of—

(6) Stems with the vowel *ε* or *ο* and Stems in which the vowel is lost; as *ἔχ-ω* (for **σέχ-ω*), *ἔ-σχ-ον*; *πέτ-εσθαι*, Aor. *πτ-έσθαι* (cp. *ποτ-άομαι*).

This definition will cover the reduction of *ερ*, *ελ*, *εμ*, *εν* to *ρ*, *λ*, *μ*, *ν* (instead of *ᾱρ*, *ᾱλ*, *ᾱ*); as in *ἔγρ-ετο* (*ἔγερ-* in *ἐγείρω*), *ἔ-πλ-ετο* (*πέλ-ω*), *ἔ-τε-τμ-ον* (*τέμ-*

* Similarly, *ᾱλ(λᾱ)* with *ελ* and *ολ*: but it is difficult to find examples in Greek. The form *πί-πλᾶ-μεν* perhaps answers to an original Sing. **πί-πελ-μι* (cp. Sanser. *pīparmi*, Pl. *pīpr-mas*, Brugmann, *M. U. I.* p. 44), and the form *τέ-τλά-μεν* to **τέ-τολ-α* (Lat. *tetuli*).

νω), ξ-πε-φν-ον (φεν-, cp. φόν-ος). Thus we have an apparent interchange of two short Stems, as φν- in ξπε-φν-ον with φᾱ- in πέ-φᾱ-ται, &c.

When loss of ε would make the word unpronounceable, it is sometimes retained in the short form, as in ξ-τεκ-ον, τεκ-εῖν (Stems τεκ-, ток-).

Again, there are in general two longer forms of each Stem, one marked by the predominance of the sounds ε, η, the other by that of ο, ω. The chief interchanges which are due to this cause are—

(7) ε and ο, including the combinations ει, ευ, ερ, ελ, εμ, εν and οι, ου, ορ, ολ, ομ, ον. It is needless to give further examples.

(8) ᾱ (Ionic η) and ω: ξ-πτη flew, πτήσσω cower, and πέ-πτω-κα; cp. φη-μί and φω-νή, ὀδ-ηγός and ἄγ-ωγ-ή.

(9) η and ω: ῥήγ-νυμι and ῥρ-ρωγα; cp. ἀρήγω and ἀρωγ-ός, ῥῥος and εἰωθα.

(10) In a certain number of Stems the only variation is between ω and ο: δι-δω-μι (δο-), δδ-ωδα, δλ-ωλα.

The Endings which are found with the long Stem have been called the *Light*, the others the *Heavy* Endings.

The short form of the Stem is usually called the *Weak* Stem. Of the longer forms that which contains the vowel ο (οι, ου, ον, ορ, ολ) may be distinguished as the *O-form*: the other will be simply called the *Strong* form.

The different variations may be represented in a tabular form:—

Strong	ᾱ(η)	η	ω	ει	ευ	ερ(ρε)	ελ	εμ	εν	ε
O-form	ω	ω	ω	οι	ου	ορ(ρο)	ολ	ομ	ον	ο
Weak	ᾱ	ε	ο	ι	υ	ρ	λ	μ	ν	nil
						ᾱρ(ρᾱ)	ᾱλ	ᾱ	ᾱ	ᾱ
								ᾱμ	ᾱν	

7.] The 3 Plur. offers some exceptions to the general rule:—

(1) The Ending -ᾶσι (for -ᾶτι, -NTI) is used with the long Stem of the Pf., as λελόγχ-ᾶσι, πεφύκ-ᾶσι. Cp. Mid. τετεύχ-ᾶται, ἐ-τετεύχ-ᾶτο (§ 22, 5).

(2) The long Stem is also found in a few forms of the Pf. with the Ending -ᾶσι, as πεποιθᾶσι, ἐστήκᾶσι (§ 24), and of the Aor. in -α, as ἔχευαν, ἔθικαν, ἔδωκαν (§ 15).

(3) The Endings -(σ)ᾶσι, -σαν (for -ΣANTI, -ΣANT) are found with the weak Stem. The leading examples are:—

With Simple Stems: ἴ-σαν, ξ-φα-σαν, ξ-θε-σαν, ξ-δο-σαν, &c.

Presents: τιθέ-ασι, διδό-ασι (Att.); ἐ-τίθε-σαν, ἐ-δίδο-σαν, &c.

Perfects: ἴσασι (ιδ-σασι), ἴσαν; εἴξασι (Att. 3 Plur. of ξοικα).

βεβά-ασι, γεγά-ασι, μεμά-ασι; Plpf. βέβα-σαν, μέμα-σαν.

ἐστᾶσι (for ἐστά-ασι), τεθνᾶσι; ἔστα-σαν, τέθνα-σαν.

πεφύ-ασι, δεδί-ασι; δείδι-σαν.

The hiatus shows that -ᾶσι is for -σᾶσι, the Primary Ending

answering to -σάν. The corresponding Mid. -σάται is found in Doric (γεγράφεται, *Tab. Heracl.* i. 121, in *C. I.* 5774).

The contraction in ἑστᾶσι, τεθνᾶσι is evidently due to the impossibility of ἑστᾶ-ασι, τεθνᾶ-ασι in the hexameter. Brugmann regards them as wrongly accented, and would write ἑστασι, τέθνασι, i. e. ἑστα-ντι, τέθνα-ντι (*Curt. Stud.* ix. 296). This is open to the objection (1) that it separates them from βεβά-ασι, γεγά-ασι, μεμά-ασι; and (2) that in all other Stems which form a Pf. or Aor. in -κα the Endings -ντι and -ν are confined in Homer to the forms with -κ: thus we find—

πεφύκ-ασι	and	πεφύ-ασι,	but not	πέφυσι
ἑστήκασι, &c.	„	βεβά-ασι,	„	βέβασι
(οἶδασι Hdt.)	„	ἴσασι	„	ἴδ-ασι
ἔθηκα-ν	„	ἔθε-σαν	„	ἔθε-ν
ἔδωκα-ν	„	ἔδο-σαν	„	ἔδο-ν (Hesiod).

The weak form with -ντι, -ν is therefore confined to Verb-Stems ending in a vowel, as in φασί, τιθεῖσι (for φαντί, τίθε-ντι). And in these the short vowel is due to the (original) following -NT, as in ἔ-σταν, ἤγεθρον, ἀλό-ντες, &c.

For a plausible hypothesis as to the origin of the Ending -σαν see § 40. Regarding -(σ)ασι (i. e. the Ending -ασι preceded by hiatus) no satisfactory view has been put forward.

Meaning of the Middle.

8.] The original force of the Middle Person-Endings is 'Reflexive;' that is to say, they denote that the action of the Verb is directed towards the agent.

Greek has no Passive Endings distinct from those of the Active and Middle: it is desirable therefore to speak, not of Passive *forms*, but of the Passive *meaning* or *use* of a form.

The chief uses of the Middle are—

(1) The use to signify that the agent is also the *indirect object* of the action—that the action is done by some one *for* or *toward* himself, or in his own interest: ἐννυ-μαι *I put* (clothes, &c.) *on myself*; δέχο-μαι *I take to myself*; ἄορ. ὄξυ ἐρυσσάμενος *having drawn him his sharp sword*; ἠρέϊτο τόξον *took his bow with him*; φερέσθω *let him bear away (as his prize)*.

(2) The use in which the agent is the direct object of the action, as λούο-μαι *I wash myself*. This is comparatively rare.

(3) The Intransitive use, in which the reflexive sense is faint, as φαίνε-ται *appears* (but φαίνει ἑαυτόν *he shows himself*). So, generally, when the action centres in the agent; as in Verbs of *bodily action* (έρχομαι, πέτομαι, ἄλλομαι, οἶχομαι, &c.), and in such uses as λαβέσθαι *to gain a hold* (not *to take a thing*), δεδραγμένος *clutching*; ἐχέαιτο *threw her arms*; also in Verbs of *feeling* and *thinking* (αἰσθάνομαι, αἰδέομαι, βούλομαι, οἶομαι, μέμνημαι, ἐπίσταμαι, μέλομαι, μέφομαι, &c.). So in French, 'je m'aperçois' *I perceive*, 'je me doute' *I suspect*, 'il se peut' *it may be*.

(4) The Reciprocal use; ἀμειβόμενος *taking his turn*; λέγεσθαι *to tell over* (in talk); ἀρέσκεσθαι *to make friends with*; νυσσομένων (Il. 14. 26) *as they pierced each other*; ἐρείδεσθον (Il. 23. 735) *push each other, strive*. Hence the Middle form of μάχομαι, Fr. *se battre* and its equivalents, ἀγωνίζομαι, ἀμύλλομαι, δικάζομαι.

(5) The Passive use, as ἔχε-ται *is possessed*, ἐβλη-το *was struck*, δέδε-το *was bound*, ἐκ-πέπο-ται *is drunk up*. This is not a very common use of the Middle. It may be illustrated from the similar use of some Reflexive Verbs in French, as 'je me trouve' *I am found*, 'il se mange' *it is eaten*.

The Middle is rather more common in Homer than in later Greek. For example, in the class of Verbs of *feeling* and *thinking* we may add the Homeric ἔραμαι, γάννυμαι, ἔλδομαι, ἔλπομαι, ὄθομαι, ὄνομαι, στένομαι, κεχάροντο, ὀδύσασθαι. And the use is extended to Verbs of *seeing* and *hearing*, as ὀρῶ-μαι (Aor. ἰδέ-σθαι), ἀκούο-μαι (used as well as ὀρῶ, ἰδεῖν, ἀκούω), δέρκομαι, ὄσσομαι, σκέπτομαι, φράζομαι; cp. the Attic σκοποῦ-μαι *I consider*.

Conversely, Homer has the Act. ὀίω *I think, expect*, as well as the Mid. ὀίο-μαι *I harbour the thought, suspect* (cp. the distinction in French between *je doute* and *je me doute*).

Sometimes (esp. in Homer) the Middle appears to be used because the Verb implies acting *arbitrarily, as a superior, &c.*; e.g. βιάζομαι *I use force towards*, σίνομαι, δηλέομαι, &c. *I do mischief for pleasure*; ἐφίλατο *made a favourite of*; δλε-νται *run in a race, δλεσθαι to chase* (but δλον *I fled*); δειδίσσεσθαι *to terrify*; κέκλετο *shouted in command*.*

A use intermediate between the Reflexive and the Passive (pointed out by Riddell, *Dig.* § 88) may be exemplified in ἀπήχθετο *got himself hated, incurred hatred*, κτείνονται (Il. 13. 110) *let themselves be slain*, λείπεσθε (Il. 23. 409) *get left behind*: cp. Il. 13. 525., 15. 645, Od. 3. 284.

On the Futures only used in the Mid., see § 66.

CHAPTER II.

THE TENSES.

9.] **Verb-Stem and Tense-Stem.** A comparison of the different forms of a Greek VERB usually enables us to see that some one syllable or group of syllables is present in them all: as τυπ- in the forms of τύπτω, or βουλευ- in those of βουλεύω.

* Cp. Icelandic 'heita' *I promise*, 'heitað' *I threaten*.

This we shall call the *Verb-Stem*. A Verb-Stem not derived from more primitive elements is called a *Root*.

Again, the different forms belonging to any one TENSE are based upon a common part, which we shall call the *Tense-Stem*. This part may be the same as the Verb-Stem; or it may contain an additional element, as δι- in δι-δο-μεν, δι-δο-λη-ν, &c.; -τε, -το in τύπ-τε-τε, τύπ-το-μεν, ἔ-τυπ-το-ν, τύπ-το-ι-μι, &c.

The Subjunctive and Optative, again, are distinguished by a Suffix to the Tense-Stem: e.g. δο-λη-ν, διδο-λη-ν, τύπτο-ι-μι, στήσα-ι-μι. The new Stems so formed may be called *Mood-Stems*.

Finally, the Stems used in the 'Historical' Tenses—the Impf., Aor., and Plpf.—are formed from the Tense-Stem by prefixing the *Augment*.

The Stems of the augmented forms are therefore parallel to the Mood-Stems, the only difference being that they are formed by a prefix, while the Mood-Stems are formed by a suffix. They may be described as Time-Moods of the several Tenses,—combining the notion of Past Time, which is expressed by the Augment, with the meaning contained in the Tense-Stem.

Each Tense-Stem furnishes an *Infinitive* and a *Participle*.

Thus we have (supplying one or two links by analogy) from the three Tense-Stems βαλλε (or -ο), βαλε (or -ο), βεβληκα.

	PRES.	AOR.	PERF.
Principal Tense	βάλλε-τε	wanting	βεβλήκα-τε.
Historical	ἔ-βάλλε-τε	ἔ-βάλε-τε	ἔ-βεβλήκε-α.
Subjunctive	βάλλη-τε	βάλῃ-τε	βεβλήκη-τε.
Optative	βάλλο-ι-τε	βάλο-ι-τε	βεβλήκο-ι-τε.
Imperative	βάλλε-τε	βάλε-τε	βεβλήκα-τε.
Infinitive	βαλλέ-μεναι	βαλέ-ειν	βεβληκ-έναι.
Participle	βάλλο-ντος	βαλό-ντος	βεβληκ-ότος.

It is evident that there might have been a Future 'Time-Mood' as well as a Past for each Tense-Stem. In English indeed we can distinguish progressive action in the future as well as in the present and past: *I shall be writing* as well as *I am writing* and *I was writing*. See Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses*, § 65; Driver's *Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, § 4. Modern Greek has two such Futures, θὰ γράφω *I will be writing* and θὰ γράψω *I will write*, related to each other as ἔγραφον and ἔγραψα.

10.] **Formation of Tense-Stems.** Leaving out of sight the meanings of the several Tenses, and looking to the mode of their formation, we may distinguish the following groups:—

(1) With the Verb-Stem serving as Tense-Stem—

The Simple Non-Thematic Present, as φη-μί.

The Simple Non-Thematic Aorist, as ἔ-βην.

The Aorist in -ᾶ, as ἔ-χευ-α.

- (2) With Tense-Stem enlarged from Verb-Stem—
 The Non-Thematic Reduplicated Present, as *τί-θη-μι*.
 The Present in *-νη-μι* and *-νῦ-μι*, as *σκίδ-νῆ-μι*, *δέικ-νῦ-μι*.
 The Perfect.
- (3) With the Thematic Vowel—
 The ordinary Thematic Present, as *λέγω*.
 The Present with short Stem, as *ἄγω*.
 The Simple Thematic Aorist, as *ἔ-λαῖβ-ο-ν*.
- (4) With Reduplication (Thematic)—
 The Thematic Reduplicated Present, as *γί-γν-ο-μαι*.
 The Thematic Reduplicated Aorist, as *ἡγ-ᾶγ-ο-ν*.
- (5) With other Suffixes (Non-Thematic)—
 The Aorist in *-σα*, and in *-σε*, *-σο*.
 The Aorist in *-ν* (Aor. II Pass.).
 The Aorist in *-θη-ν* (Aor. I Pass.).
- (6) With other Suffixes (Thematic)—
 The Present in *-τω* (T-Class of Curtius).
 The Present in *-νω* (Nasal Class).
 The Present in *-σκω*, and the Iterative forms.
 The Present in *-ιω* (I-Class).
 The Future in *-σω*, *-(σ)ω*.

The Non-Thematic Present and Aorist.

11.] **The Simple Non-Thematic Present.** The chief Presents in which the Tense-Stem is the same as the Verb-Stem are—

εἰ-μί (for *ἐσ-μί*) *I am*, *εἶ-μι* *I go*, *φη-μί* *I say*, *ἦ* *he said*, *κεῖ-ται* *lies*, *ἦσ-ται* *sits* (3 Plur. *εἶ-αται*, properly *ἦ-αται*, for **ἦσ-αται*), *ἐπί-στα-μαι* *I know*, *ἄγα-μαι* *I wonder*, *ἔρα-μαι* *I love*, *δύνα-μαι* *I am able*, *ἐ-κρέμω* (for *ἐ-κρέμα-ο*) *didst hang*, *δέα-το* *seemed*, *δίε-νται* *race* (*ἐν-δίε-σαν* *tried to scare*), *ὄνο-σαι* *dost blame* (*ὄνα-το* Il. 17. 25), *ἄη-τον* *blow*, *κική-την* *caught*, *ἔπυ-το* *protected*, *στεῦ-ται* *is ready, threatens*, *ἔδ-μεναι* *to eat*: also *ἔτο* *desired* (*ἱέμενος* *eager*), if it is to be separated from *ἔημι* and referred to *ἔλεμαι*, Sanscr. *vī* (see § 397). For *ἔληθι* see § 16.

On the Non-Thematic forms of Contracted Verbs (such as *φορή-μενος*), see § 19.

12.] **Variation of the Stem** according to the 'weight' of the ending is carried out consistently in *φη-μί* and *εἰ-μι*. Thus—

Pres. *φη-μί*, *φῆ-ς*, *φη-σί*, Plur. *φᾶ-μέν*, *φᾶ-τέ*, *φασί*.

Impf. *ἔ-φη-ν*, *ἔ-φη-ς* and *ἔ-φη-σθα*, *ἔ-φη*, 1 Plur. *φᾶ-μεν* (for *ἔ-φᾶμεν*), 3 Plur. *ἔ-φᾶ-σαν* and *ἔφαν*, Part. *φάς*.

Mid. 2 Plur. *φάσθε*, Impf. *ἐφάμην*, *ἐφᾶτο*, Imper. *φάο*, *φάσθω*, Inf. *φάσθαι*, Part. *φᾶμενος*.

And similarly—

Pres. *εἶμι*, *εἶσθα*, *εἶσι*, 3 Du. *ἵτον*, Plur. *ἵμεν*, *ἵτε*, *ἴασι*.

Impf. 3 Du. *ἵτην*, 3 Plur. *ἴσαν*, Imper. *ἵθι*, *ἵτω*, *ἵτε*, Inf. *ἵμεναι* (once *ἵ*), and *λέναι*.

The 1 Sing. *ἦα* does not represent the original form of the Impf, which would be *ῆα* (for *ῆα*, Sanscr. *āyam*). Hence *ἦα* with the 3 Sing. *ῆε* and 3 Plur. *ῆσαν* must be formed like *ῆδεα* and other Pluperfects in *-εα* (§ 68, 2); the *ε* of the original *ῆεα*, *ῆεσαν* being changed to *ι* under the influence of *ἵμεν*, &c. (Wackernagel, *K. Z.* xxv. 266). For *-σαν* see § 40.

The forms *ῆτον* (1 Sing. and 3 Plur.), *ἴεν*, Part. *ἴων*, are evidently produced by confusion with the Thematic conjugation (§ 30, cp. also § 18).

The Verb *εἰμί* *I am* is inflected as follows:—

	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Dual.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Pres.	1. <i>εἰμί</i>	—	<i>εἰμέν</i> (for <i>ἔσ-μέν</i>)
	2. <i>ἔσ-σί</i> , <i>εἶς</i> (§ 5)	<i>ἔσ-τόν</i>	<i>ἔσ-τέ</i>
	3. <i>ἔσ-τι(ν)</i>	<i>ἔσ-τόν</i>	<i>εἰσί</i> (Dor. <i>ἐντί</i>), <i>ἔ-ασι</i> .
Impf.	1. <i>ῆα</i> , <i>ῆα</i> (Th. <i>ἔον</i>)	—	<i>ῆμεν</i>
	2. <i>ῆσθα</i> , <i>ἔησθα</i>	—	<i>ῆτε</i>
	3. <i>ῆεν</i> , <i>ῆν</i> , <i>ἔην</i> , <i>ῆην</i> (Dor. <i>ῆς</i>)	<i>ῆσ-την</i>	<i>ῆσαν</i> , <i>ἔσαν</i> , <i>ῆν</i> (Hes.).

Imper. *ἔσ-τω*, *ἔσ-τε*, *ἔσ-των*; Inf. *ἔμμεναι*, *ἔμεναι*, *ἔμεν*, *εἶναι*; Imper. Mid. *ἔσ-σο* (Od. i. 302).

The root *ἔσ-* is not reduced before Heavy Endings, as in the corresponding Sanscr. forms (Dual *s-vas*, *s-thas*, *s-tas*, Plur. *s-mas*, *-tha*, *s-anti*, Opt. *syām*), and the Lat. *sumus*, *sunt*, *sūm*. The loss of *σ* in *εἰμί*, *εἰμέν*, *ῆμεν* (for *ἔσ-μί*, &c.) is according to Greek phonetic law: the Attic *ἔσ-μέν* is a new formation, due to the analogy of *ἔσ-τι*, *ἔσ-τέ*, &c. On the other hand *ῆτε* (Il. 16. 557) follows *ῆμεν*; the older *ῆσ-τε* survives in Attic. The *σ* of *ῆσαν* belongs to the ending *-σαν* (§ 40), not to the root.

In the Impf. it is probable that we have an admixture of forms from the original Perfect: thus *ῆσ-θα* (Sanskcr. *āsitha*) is Pf., *ῆα*, for **ῆσα*, is both Pf. (Sanskcr. *āsa*) and Impf. (Sanskcr. *āsam*), *ῆεν* may be Pf. (Sanskcr. *āsa*) or thematic Impf. (answering to the Homeric 1 Sing. *ἔον*); the original 3 Sing. Impf. survives in the Dor. *ῆς* (Vedic *ās*). Again, the 2 Sing. *ἔησθα* and 3 Sing. *ἔην*, *ῆην* seem to require a stem (ἐ)ση-, found also in Lat. *e-rām* (Brugmann, *M. U.* i. p. 35). The *-ν* of the 3 Sing. is unexplained: it does not appear to be the *ν* ἐφελκυστικόν, for we find no form **ῆε* alongside of *ῆεν*.

Note that the 1 Sing. *ῆν* is not found in Homer.

The Homeric forms of *εἰμί* were discussed some years ago by L. Meyer (*K. Z.* ix. pp. 385, 423). He maintained that the Homeric 3 Sing. Impf. was *ῆεν* or (without augment) *ἔεν*: the forms *ῆν*, *ἔην* and *ῆην* being due to

corruption or misreading. The facts certainly give much countenance to this view, which has been adopted by Curtius (*Stud.* i. 2, 292) and Nauck. It can hardly be accidental that out of 54 places in which *ην* occurs in the *thesis* or second half of the foot, there are 50 in which it is followed by a vowel, as—

Il. 2. 77 Νέστωρ ὅς βα Πύλοιο ἀναξ ἦν ἡμαθύντος.

Od. 17. 208 ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' αἰγείρων ὑδατοτρεφέων ἦν ἄλσος.

Moreover, out of 72 instances of *ἦν* there are 63 in which it is followed by a consonant (including *F*). On the other hand, in 26 places *ην* occurs in the first half of the foot, and in 2 places it ends the line (in the phrase οὐδ' ἄρα πᾶς *ην*); and it is not easy to correct many of these so as to admit *ἦεν* or *ἔεν*. Again, *ην* and *ἔην* have some support in the 2 Sing. forms *ἦσθα*, *ἔσθα*. (For *ἔσθα* Curtius proposed *ἔεσθα*, but there is no good reason for this.) And *ἔην* is found on an Ionic inscription of the 5th century (Röhl, no. 382). On the whole it seems that the argument for *ἔεν* is stronger than the argument against *ην* and *ἔην*. Perhaps we must recognise two Stems, giving four forms: a Stem *ἔσ-*, whence *ἦεν*, without augment *ἔεν*, and a Stem (*ἔσ*η- (Lat. *e-rām*), whence *ἔ-ην*, without augment *ἦν*. The rare *ἦην* occurs followed by a vowel (so that we cannot read *ἦεν*) in 3 places only, viz. Od. 19. 283 (al. *εἶη*, *ἦεν*), 23. 316., 24. 343. It may be due to mere 'contamination' of *ἦεν* and *ἔην*. But no theory can be accepted as satisfactory that does not account for the fixed *-v* of all these forms.

The *α* of *ἔα* is treated as long in 3 places, Il. 4. 321., 5. 887., Od. 14. 352. In Od. 14. 222 τοῖος ἔ' ἐν πολέμῳ it is elided; but perhaps the *ἐν* may be omitted.

The vowel remains long before Heavy Endings in the Stems—

ἀη-, 3 Du. *ἄη-τον*, Inf. *ἀή-μεναι*, Mid. *ἄη-το*, Part. *ἀή-μενος*,

κίχη-, 3 Du. Impf. *κίχή-την*, 1 Plur. *ἐ-κίχη-μεν*, Inf. *κίχή-μεναι*, Part. *κίχή-μενος*,

except that it is shortened before *-ντ* and *-ι* (§ 6), as in the Part. *ἀέντες blowing*, 3 Plur. *ἄεισι* (for *ἄε-ντι*, in Hes. Th. 875), and the Opt. *κίχε-λη may find*. The vowel is also long in *ἐρῦ-το protected*, Inf. *ῥῦ-σθαι*; and in all forms of *κεῖμαι*, *ἦμαι*, *στεῖμαι*.

A similar Non-thematic inflexion, in which the final vowel of the Stem is long except before *-ντ* and *-ι*, appears in the Æolic conjugation of verbs in *-μι*, as *γέλαι-μι I laugh*, *αἰνη-μι I praise* (Hes. Op. 681), *φίλη-μι I love* (1 Plur. *φίλη-μεν*, 3 Plur. *φίλεισι*, Part. *φιλή-μενος*), *σάω-μι I save*. See § 19.

13.] The Simple Non-Thematic Aorist. This term includes the 'Second Aorists,' such as *ἔ-βη-ν ἔ-στη-ν* &c., and also those so-called First Aorists in which the *-α* of the 1 Sing. Active is added directly to the Verb-stem, as in *ἔ-χευ-α*.

Variation of quantity is rare in the Active, but the Stem is usually shortened in the Middle. The chief forms are:—*ἔ-βη-ν I went*, 3 Du. *βᾶ-την* (but also *ἔ-βήτην*), 3 Plur. *ὑπέρ-βᾶ-σαν*, Imper. *μετά-βηθι*, Inf. *βή-μεναι*: *ἔ-στη-ν I stood*, Du. *στή-την*, Plur. *ἔ-στη-μεν*, *ἔ-στη-τε*, *ἔ-στη-σαν*, Imper. *στή-θι*, *στή-τε*, Inf. *στή-μεναι*; *ἔ-φθῃ came before*, Part. *φθᾶ-μενος*: *ἔξ-έ-πιτῃ flew out*

(Hes. Op. 98), 3 Du. κατα-πή-την *cowered*, Mid. ἐ-πτα-το *flew*: ἐ-σβη *was quenched*; ἐ-τλη-ν *I endured*, Plur. ἐ-τλη-μεν, ἐ-τλη-τε, Imper. τλή-τω, τλή-τε; ἐ-γνώ-ν *I knew*, 3 Du. γνώ-την, 3 Plur. ἐ-γνώ-σαν; ἐπ-έ-πλω-ς *didst sail over*, Part. ἐπι-πλώ-ς; βιώ-τω *let him live*, Inf. βιώ-ναι; ἀλώ-ναι *to be taken*, Part. ἀλούς; ἐ-φθι-το *perished*; κτί-μενος *built*; ἐ-δύ *sank under*, 3 Du. ἐ-δύ-την, 2 Plur. ἐ-δύ-τε, Imper. δύ-θι, Inf. δύ-μεναι; ἐ-φῦ *grew*, 3 Plur. ἐ-φῦ-σαν (H. Ven. 265): λύ-το *was loosed* (once λῦ-το, Il. 24. 1). κλύ-θι *hear*, Plur. κλύ-τε (Part. κλύ-μενος as a Proper Name in Homer). On the forms ἐσσῦ-το, ἐ-χῦ-το see § 15.

The vowel is invariably long in ξυμ-βλή-την *the two encountered*, Mid. βλή-το *was struck*; πλή-το *was filled*; πλή-το *came near*; ἀπ-όνη-το *profited*, Imper. ὄνη-σο, Part. ὄνη-μενος; ἀμ-πνῦ-το *recovered breath*; ἐ-στρω-το *was strewn*: see § 14.

On the other hand the vowel is short throughout in κατ-έ-κτᾱ-ν (Il. 4. 319, where some ancient critics read κατέκτᾱ), 3 Sing. ἐ-κτᾱ (the quantity is proved by Od. 11. 410 ἔκτα σὺν οὐλομένη κ. τ. λ.), 1 Plur. ἐ-κτᾱ-μεν, Part. κατα-κτάς, Mid. ἐ-κτᾱ-το, Inf. κτά-σθαι, Part. κτᾱ-μενος. The longer form of the root is κτεν- (Pres. κτείνω for κτεν-ιω). A similarly irregular 3 Sing. in -ᾱ is found in οὔτα *he wounded*, Inf. οὐτᾱ-μεναι, Part. Mid. οὐτᾱ-μενος: perhaps also in ἀπ-ήυρα-ς, ἀπ-ήύρα. For, comparing the Part. ἀπο-ύρας, Mid. ἀπο-υρά-μενος (Hes. Sc. 173), we may conjecture that the Indic. should be written ἀπ-εὔρα-ς, ἀπ-εὔρα (or ἀπ-έ-φρά-ς, ἀπ-έ-φρά), where φρά- is the weak form of a root φερ- (Meyer, G. G. § 524). We have -ᾱ for -εν also in ἀπ-έ-φα-το *died* (Hesych.), from the root φεν- (Pf. πέφᾱ-ται).

On the Non-Thematic Aorists with Stems ending in a consonant, such as ἄλτο, ἐ-παλτο, ὦρτο, δέκτο, λέκτο, μίκτο, &c., with the Inf. πέρθαι and the Participles ἄρμενος, ἵκμενος, ἄσμενος, see § 40.

14.] **Metathesis.** This term has been employed to explain a number of forms in which a short vowel is lost before a liquid, and the corresponding long vowel follows the two consonants thus brought together: as ξυμ-βλή-την *met*, Mid. βλή-το *was struck* (βάλλ-, βέλ-ος), ἐ-τλη *endured* (τάλα-ς), πλή-το *drew near* (πέλα-ς), πλή-το *was filled* (Sanscr. par-), ἐ-στρω-το *was scattered* (στορε-), κλη-τός *called* (καλ-έω, κέλ-ομαι), κασί-γνη-τος *kinsman* (γεν-), μέμνη-μαι (μεν-), δημ-τός *tamed* (δᾱμᾱ-), &c. But this long vowel—*ā*, *η*, or *ω*—is clearly of the same nature as the *η* of σχή-σω (σεχ-), ἐνι-σπή-σω (σεπ-), πε-πτη-ώς (πετ-, πί-πτ-ω), ἄμμι (root *av* in *αὔρα*), or the *ω* of πέ-πτω-κα (πετ-), ἐ-γνώ-ν (root *gan*), ζω-ός (root *gi*, hence Greek ζη- and ζω-, for γη-η, γι-ω). In these and many similar cases 'metathesis' is out of the question. Moreover we find several Stems of the same character with the long vowel *υ*,

as $\rho\upsilon$ -σθαι to *shield* ($F\rho\upsilon$ -), $\rho\upsilon$ -τός drawn ($F\rho\upsilon$ -, $F\rho\upsilon$ -), $\tau\rho\acute{\upsilon}$ -ω (cp. $\tau\rho$ -η-, root *tar*). Hence it is probable that the long vowel is of the nature of a suffix, by which a new verbal stem is formed from the primitive stem or 'root.' This vowel usually does not vary with the Person-endings, but is long in all forms of the Tense. It cannot be an accident, however, that the same Stems appear also as disyllables with a *short* final vowel: $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda$ -ᾶ, $\pi\epsilon\lambda$ -ᾶ, $\sigma\tau\omicron\rho$ -ε, $\kappa\alpha\lambda$ -ε (in $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}$ -σαι), $\gamma\epsilon\nu$ -ε (in $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon$ -σις), $\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu$ -ᾶ, $\pi\epsilon\tau$ -ᾶ, $F\epsilon\rho$ -ῦ in $\epsilon\rho\acute{\upsilon}$ -σαι, and many others. What then is the relation between these forms and the monosyllabic $\tau\lambda$ -η, $\pi\lambda$ -η, $\sigma\tau\rho$ -ω, $\kappa\lambda$ -η, $\gamma\nu$ -η, $\delta\mu$ -η, $\pi\tau$ -η? Apparently the difference is ultimately one of accent. The same disyllable would become $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda$ -α or $\tau\lambda$ -ή as the stress fell upon the first or the second syllable*.

15.] **Aorists in -ᾶ and -κά.** These consist of (1) four Aorists from stems ending in -υ, (2) three Aorists in -κά, and (3) the isolated forms $\eta\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha$ and $\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha$.

The four Aorists $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon$ -α (weak stem $\sigma\upsilon$ -) *I urged*, ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\upsilon$ -α or ϵ - $\chi\epsilon$ -α *I poured*, ϵ - $\kappa\eta$ -α (weak stem $\kappa\alpha\upsilon$ -) *I burned*, $\eta\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}$ -ατο *avoided* (Opt. $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}$ -αιτο, Inf. $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}$ -ασθαι) form the 1 Sing. with -ᾶ instead of -υ. Thus ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\upsilon$ -α is formed like ϵ - $\phi\eta$ -υ, except that, after the diphthong *eu* the final -m of the ending passed into -ᾶ, as in the Impf. $\eta\alpha$ (for $\eta\sigma$ -α). So too in the Accusative of Nouns we have -υ after a single vowel ($\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron$ -υ, $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota$ -υ, $\iota\chi\theta\acute{\upsilon}$ -υ), but -ᾶ after ηυ, ευ or a consonant: $\nu\eta$ -α (for $\nu\eta\upsilon$ -α or $\nu\eta\acute{\upsilon}$ -α), $\pi\acute{o}\delta$ -α, as in Latin *nāv-em*, *ped-em*. The forms without υ, as $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\alpha$, $\epsilon\kappa\eta\alpha$, are obtained by υ passing into the semi-vowel ($\epsilon\chi\epsilon$ -α for $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$).

The original inflexion then was ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\upsilon$ -α (ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\upsilon$ -α), ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\upsilon$ -s, ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\upsilon$ -(τ), Plur. ϵ - $\chi\upsilon$ -μεν, ϵ - $\chi\upsilon$ -τε (cp. ϵ - $\kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}$ -μεν, § 13), ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\upsilon$ -αν, Mid. ϵ - $\chi\upsilon$ -το (like ϵ - $\phi\acute{\alpha}$ -το, ϵ - $\kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}$ -το), &c. Thus $\epsilon\chi\upsilon\tau\omicron$ and $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\upsilon\tau\omicron$ are primitive forms, standing to $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$, $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$ as ϵ - $\phi\acute{\alpha}$ -το to ϵ - $\phi\eta$ -υ.

How then are we to account for such forms as ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha$ -μεν, ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha$ -το, $\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}$ -μενος, $\eta\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha$ -το? They are obtained from the 1 Sing. and 3 Plur. by treating the stem *plus* the -ᾶ as a new stem or base, to which the Person-endings are then attached. Thus ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$ -s, ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha$ -μεν, ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha$ -το are duplicate forms, related to ϵ - $\chi\epsilon\upsilon$ -s, ϵ - $\chi\upsilon$ -μεν, ϵ - $\chi\upsilon$ -το as the later $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$ -s, $\omicron\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}$ -μεν to $\omicron\iota\sigma\theta\alpha$,

* Joh. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxiii. 277; Brugmann, *M. U.* i. 1-68; Fröhde, *B. B.* ix. 119. The whole subject, as Brugmann has recently warned us (*Grundriss*, ii. § 8, n. 1), is full of uncertainty, and it is possible that forms such as *pelē* represent the 'root' or primitive word, from which not only *plē*- ($\pi\lambda\eta$ -, Lat. *plē-nus*) and *pele*-, but also *pel*- (Sanscr. *pi-par-ti*) and *pl*- ($\pi\acute{\iota}$ - $\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ -μεν), are derived. We are dealing here, not with the derivation of Greek, &c. from Indo-European, — where the comparison of other languages, such as Sanscrit, may give us help, — but with the formation of Indo-European itself, to which the comparative method is *ex hypothesi* inapplicable.

ἰδ-μεν. The 3 Sing. in -ει(ν), follows the analogy of the Thematic conjugation (ἔχευε like ἔλεγε).

The three Aorists in -κά, ἔ-θηκα *I put*, ἔ-ηκα *I sent forth*, ἔ-δωκα *I gave*, are inflected as follows:—

1 Sing. ἔ-θηκα		1 Plur. ἔ-θε-μεν
2 „ ἔ-θηκα-ς	2 Du. ἔ-θε-τον	2 „ ἔ-θε-τε
3 „ ἔ-θηκε(ν)	3 „ ἔ-θέ-την	3 „ { ἔ-θε-σαν ἔ-θηκα-ν.

Imper. θέ-ς, θέ-τω, Plur. θέ-τε, θέ-ντων.

Inf. θέ-μεναι, θέ-μεν, θεῖναι, Part. θεῖς, θέ-ντος, &c.

Mid. ἐ-θέ-μην &c. with θε- as stem throughout.

Thus *θηκα*-, *ήκα*-, *δωκα*- alternate with *θε*-, *έ*-, *δο*- as long and short Stems respectively. The only forms in Homer which do not conform to this scheme are the 1 Plur. ἐν-ήκα-μεν (Od. 12. 401), and the 3 Sing. Mid. θήκα-το (Il. 10. 31, 14. 187, also Hes. Th. 175). The primitive 3 Plur. ἔ-δο-ν occurs in Hes. Th. 30, and in Doric: ἔ-θε-ν only on inscriptions (*C. I.* 29).

The Homeric forms with the stem ἐ- do not take the augment: in Attic we have (e.g.) εἶ-μεν εἶ-τε (for ἐ-έ-μεν ἐ-έ-τε).

In respect of the -ᾶ of the Stem the 2 Sing. ἔ-θηκα-ς is formed like ἔ-χενα-ς, and the occasional examples of the type ἔ-θήκα-μεν, ἔ-θήκα-το are parallel to ἔ-χεύα-μεν, ἔ-χεύα-το. That is to say, the -ᾶ comes from ἔ-θηκα, ἔ-θηκα-ν. The relation of ἔ-θήκα-μεν, ἔ-θήκα-το to ἔ-θε-μεν, ἔ-θε-το, is complicated by the use of a new Verb-Stem (*θηκ*- instead of *θηγ*-). Thus it is the same as the relation of ἐστήκα-μεν to ἐστᾶ-μεν (§ 22).

The Aorist ἤνεια (without augment ἔνεια) shows no variation of stem; 1 Plur. ἐνείκα-μεν, 3 Plur. ἤνεια-ν and ἔνεια-ν, Imper. ἐνείκα-τε, Mid. 3 Plur. ἤνείκα-ντο.

On the Aorist εἶπα see § 37.

16.] The Non-Thematic Reduplicated Present. These Presents are formed by Reduplication, usually of the initial consonant with ῥ; *τιθη-σι puts*, *δίδω-μι I give*, *ιη-σι* (for *ίσση-σι*?) *sends*, *ιστᾶσι* (*σι-σᾶ-*) *they set*, *πιμπλάσι* *they fill* (the *μ* is euphonic: it is dropped after *μ* in *ἐμ-πίπλη-θι*), *δίδη bound*, *βιβᾶ-s striding*; with Attic Reduplication, *δύνη-σι* (for *δυν-ονη-*) *benefits*: perhaps also *ἰλη-θι be appeased* (*ἰλα-μαι I propitiate*, Hom. H. xxi. 5: Stem *ἰλα* for *σι-σᾶ*, Meyer, *G. G.* p. 437).

In these Present Stems the quantity of the vowel in the Stem regularly varies under the rules laid down in § 6 (1).

The vowel is long in *ἐμ-πίπλη-θι* (Il. 21. 311), *ἰλη-θι*, *δίδω-θι* (Od. 3. 380)*, and the Inf. *τιθή-μεναι* (Il. 23. 83, 247) and Part.

* The variation is perhaps less regular in the Imper.; cp. *καῦ-θι*. In Sanscr. the 3 Sing. Imper. has the strong Stem.

τιθή-μενος (Π. 10. 34). Also in δίζη-μαι *I seek* (for *δι-δεη-), the Homeric Verb answering to Attic ζη-τέω.

ζημι is now generally connected with Lat. *sero* (for *si-so*, cp. ἵστημι *sisto*). Earlier scholars (as Bopp) derived it from the root *yā* (Lat. *ja-c-io*). Possibly it represents both σ-σημι (*sā-*) and ι-ημι (*yā-*). In meaning it is much nearer to *jacio* than to *sero*.

17.] **Present Stems in -νῃ (-vā) and -νυ.** The Tense-Stems of this class—which may be called the Non-Thematic Nasal class—form the Present-Stem from the Verb-Stem by the Suffixes -νῃ, -νῦ (which with Heavy Endings regularly become -vā, -vū).

The Presents with -νῃ (-vā) are nearly all peculiar to Homer, δάμ-νῃ-μι *I subdue*, κίρ-νῃ *mixed*, πέρ-να-ς *selling*, σκίδ-να-ται *is scattered*, πῖλ-να-ται *comes near*, μάρ-να-ται *fights*. Note ι for ε in κίρ-, σκιδ-, πῖλ-; cp. the later Verbs πῖτ-νω, κτίν-νυμι.

A few Presents with -νυ are common to all periods of Greek, δείκ-νυ-μι *I show*, ὅμ-νυ-μι *I swear*, ζεύγ-νυ-μι *I join*, ὅλλυμι (for ὄλ-νυ-μι) *I destroy*; but they are mainly Homeric or poetical; ὄρ-νῦ-θι *arouse*, δαί-νῦ *feasted*, ἄγ-νυ-τον *break*, στορ-νῦσα *spreading*, ἀπ-ομόργ-νῦ *wiped away*, ἐέργ-νυ *shut in*, ῥηγ-νῦσι *they break*, γά-νυ-ται *is gladdened*, τά-νυ-ται *is stretched*, ῥ-νυ-το *was finished*, κί-νυ-ντο *were moved*, τί-νυ-νται *punish*, αἰ-νυ-ται *takes*, ἐ-καί-νυ-το *surpassed*, ἀρ-νῦ-σθην *won*, ἄχ-νυ-μαι *I am vexed*, ὤτγ-νυ-ντο *were opened*, ἐννυτο (for ἐσ-νυ-το) *put on*, ζώνυ-ντο (for ζωσ-νυ-) *girded himself*, ὀρεγ-νύ-ς *stretching out*, σβεεννυ-μενάων (Hes. Op. 590).

In the Verbs in -νῃμι the Verb-Stem is nearly always disyllabic: cp. δαμά-σαι (παν-δαμά-τωρ, &c.), κερά-σαι, πετά-σαι, περά-σαι, σκεδά-σαι, πέλα-ς. So in some Verbs in -νῦμι; cp. ὀμό-σαι, ὀλέ-σαι, στορέ-σαι. Thus we may regard δαμ-α and δαμ-νῃ, ὀμ-ο and ὀμ-νῦ, &c., as twin forms obtained by the addition of a different suffix to the same original root δαμ-, ὀμ-, &c. (§ 14). It is to be observed also that Presents in -νῃμι are often found along with forms in -άζω and -αω: δάμ-νῃμι, Attic δαμ-άζω; κίρ-νῃμι, κερ-άω: πέρ-νῃμι, περ-άω: σκίδ-νῃμι, σκεδ-άω: πῖλ-νῃμι, πελ-άζω. Cp. κάμ-νω, κάμα-τος (§ 47).

The Verb-Stem, it will be seen, has most commonly its weak form (note especially τᾶ-νυ-ται, Pf. τέ-τᾶ-ται), sometimes the strong form, as in δείκ-νυ-μι, ζεύγ-νυ-μι, ῥήγ-νυ-μι.

The forms in -αννυμι and -εννυμι are post-Homeric.

18.] **Thematic forms.** Some forms of Non-Thematic Tenses follow the conjugation of the corresponding Contracted Verbs in -αω, -εω, -οω (§ 56); especially in the Impf. Indic. and the Imperative. Thus we find:—

ἐδάμνα (as if from *δαμνάω), ἐκίρνα (Od. 7. 182, &c.), πίτνα: Imper. καθ-ίστα (Π. 9. 202).

ἐτίθει, ἔει (ἀφ-έει, προ-έει, &c.), ἄει (v. l. ἄη) *blew*, κίχεις: Imper. τίθει, ἔει (ζυν-έει).

ἐδίδους, ἐδίδου: Imper. δίδου (Od. 3. 58).

Examples occur also in the Pres. Indic.; δαμνῇ (3 Sing. Act.) in Od. 11. 221 (with v. l. δάμνα^ρ); δαμνῇ (2 Sing. Mid.) in Il. 14. 199 (with v. l. δάμνα^ρ, for δάμνα-αι); ἀν-ιείς (Il. 5. 880), μεθ-ιείς (Il. 6. 523, Od. 4. 372), μεθ-ιεί (Il. 10. 121), τιθεῖ (Il. 13. 732), παρ-τιθεῖ (Od. 1. 192), for which the MSS. usually have ἀνίεις, &c.: διδοῖς (Il. 9. 164), διδοῖ (Il. 9. 519, Od. 4. 237). So for ποτεῖ in Il. 2. 752 we should read ποιεῖ.

Add the Part. βιβῶντα (Il. 3. 22, cp. 13. 807., 16. 609), Fem. βιβῶσα (Od. 11. 539); for which Bekk. writes βιβάντα, βιβᾶσα.

Editors differ in their manner of dealing with these forms. Bekker in his second edition (1858) restored the 2 Sing. Pres. τίθης, ἴης, δίδως, and Impf. ἐτίθῃ, ἴῃ, ἐδίδω, but left the 3 Sing. τιθεῖ, διδοῖ and Imper. τίθει, ἴει, δίδου. Nauck proposes to restore καθίστη (Imper.) and the Impf. ἐδάμνη, πίννη, ἐκίρνη. In the case of τίθημι, ἴημι, δίδωμι the weight of authority seems to be for the spelling which follows the Thematic conjugation, viz. -είς, -οῖς in the 2 Sing. Pres., and -εις, -ει, -ους, -ου in the Impf. (Cobet, *Misc. Crit.* p. 281, is extremely positive on this side). But Verbs which have η in the Dual and Plural (ἀη-τον, κίχῃ-την) should follow the analogy of the Passive Aorists: hence ᾄῃ, κίχῃς. And we may leave undisturbed the form δίδῃ he bound (Il. 11. 105), for which no one has proposed to read δίδει.

The 1 Sing. προ-τεῖν (Od. 9. 88., 10. 100., 12. 9) stands alone, and is doubtless a mere error for προτήν (Bekker, ed. 1858).

Porson (in his note on Eur. Or. 141) condemns ξυνιείς, τιθείς, &c. on the ground that if τιθείς were right we ought also to have τιθῶ, τιθεῖ, τιθοῦμεν, τιθεῖτε. It is possible, however, that a form like τιθείς may have crept in through the analogy of the Verbs in -εω, although no 'Verb' τιτέω was in use. It is characteristic of the working of analogy to be partial and gradual. In Homer we find the corresponding 3 Sing. Pres. δαμνῇ, τιθεῖ, μεθειῖ, διδοῖ—forms which are guaranteed by the metre. The forms so guaranteed are indeed few, and perhaps were not found in the oldest text of the poems; but they are supported by similar forms in Herodotus and other Ionic writers*.

Similarly, in the Presents formed with -νν there is evidence of a tendency to introduce the Thematic -ννε(ο). The instances are:—

ὄρ-νν-ον (Il. 12. 142), ὤμννε (Il. 14. 278), ζεύγννον (Il. 19. 393), ὀμνν-έτω (Il. 19. 175), τανύ-ουσι, τανύ-οντο (four times),

* In considering this and similar questions it should be remembered (1) that we do not know when the Homeric poems were first written down; (2) that we do not know of any systematic attention having been paid to spelling, accentuation, &c. before the time of the Alexandrian grammarians; (3) that the tendency of oral recitation must have been to substitute later for earlier forms, unless the metre stood in the way; (4) that this modernising process went on in different parts of Greece, and therefore need not represent the exclusive influence of any one dialect; (5) that the older Ionic alphabet confused ε, ει, η and ο, ου, ω.

πανύ-ειν (Π. 17. 391), ἀνύω (Π. 4. 56, but may be Fut.). As to δαινύ-η (2 Sing. Subj. Mid.) see § 80.

Also, the Verb ῥύομαι *protect, save*, is for the most part Non-Thematic (ἔρῡ-σο, ἔρῡ-το, 3 Plur. ῥύ-ατο, Inf. ῥύ-σθαι), but partly Thematic (ῥύε-ται, ῥύε-το, ῥύο-νται, &c.), see § 11. And the Aor. ἔ-κλυ-ον is Thematic, except the Imper. κλύ-θι, κλύ-τε.

It should be observed that in all the foregoing cases the Thematic form is obtained by combining thematic endings with the final vowel of the Stem. In other cases the original final vowel is lost, as κίχε(ν) for ἐ-κίχη, δίξω for δίξη-μαι, and the like.

19.] Non-Thematic Contracted Verbs. The following Homeric forms are usually regarded as instances of 'irregular Contraction' of Verbs in -αω, -εω, -οω:—

(-αω): συναντή-την *met*, συλή-την *spoiled*, προσανδή-την *spoke to*, φοιτή-την *went about*, κνῆ *scraped*, ὀρή-μεναι *to pray*, γοή-μεναι *to bewail*, πεινή-μεναι *to hunger*, θή-σθαι *to milk*.

(-εω): ἀπειλή-την *threatened*, ὁμαρτή-την *met*, καλή-μεναι *to call*, πενθή-μεναι *to mourn*, ποθή-μεναι *to regret*, φιλή-μεναι *to love*, φορή-μεναι, φορή-ναι *to carry*, ἀλιτή-μενος *sinning*, τερσή-μεναι *to get dry* (§ 42).

(-οω): σάω 3 Sing. Impf. and also 2 Sing. Imper. of σαόω *I keep safe*.

These forms cannot be explained by the ordinary contraction with the Thematic ε or ο: e.g. φοιτή-την cannot come from *φοι-τατήν, φορή-ναι from *φορεέ-ναι, ἀλιτή-μενος from *ἀλιτεό-μενος, σάω from σάοε, &c. On the other hand, as Curtius has shown (*Stud.* iii. 377-401, *Verb.* i. 352 ff.), they agree exactly with those Non-Thematic forms in which the vowel before the Ending is long except before -ντ and -ι, such as the Pres. κιχή-μεναι, ἀή-μεναι (§ 12), the Aor. στή-μεναι, τλή-ναι, γνώ-μεναι, &c. and (as we may add by anticipation) the Passive Aorists in -ην and -θην.

Moreover, the same type of inflexion appears in the peculiar 'Verbs in -μι' of the Æolic dialect, as φίλη-μι, 1 Plur. φίλη-μεν, 3 Plur. φίλεισι (for φίλε-ντι), Part. φιλή-μενος; and also in the Latin Verbs in -āre and -ēre, except in the 1 Sing.; e.g. *amāmini* is parallel to ἀρή-μεναι, *docemini* to φορή-μεναι, *docemus*, *doce-nt* to φίλη-μεν, φίλεισι.

Further traces of this formation may be seen in those Attic verbs in -αω and -οω which take η and ω instead of α and ου respectively (as ζάω, ζῆς, ζῆ, &c., ριγώω, Inf. ριγῶν), and in the Opt. in -φην, -οιην (for which however in the case of verbs in -εω we expect -ειην, as in κιχείην and Æolic φιλείην).

These facts seem to show that the formation now in question is of high antiquity, and Curtius even maintained that it was older than the ordinary conjugation of the verbs in -άω, -εω, -οω.

In these verbs, as he pointed out, there is evidence to show that the vowel before the thematic ending was originally long (e.g. in Homeric διψάων, πεινάων, ὑπνώοντες, Æolic ποθήω, ἀδικῆει, &c.). The forms in -ᾶω, -ῆω, -ῶω, again, may represent an older (and Æolic) -ᾱμι, -ῆμι, -ῶμι, just as δεικνύω is for older δεικνύμι: and these again may be explained by contraction from -ᾱιημι, -ῆιημι, -ῶιημι, the Greek representatives of the Sanscrit -agāmi. The Latin *amo, doceo*, Pl. *amāmus, docēmus*, would fall into this scheme, if we suppose that they belong to the stage at which the thematic endings had not extended beyond the 1 Sing.

Against this theory it is urged by Brugmann (*M. U.* i. 86) that the thematic conjugation of these verbs is found also in Sanscrit, Zend, Slavo-Lithuanian and Germanic—all which members of the Indo-European family, if Curtius is right, must have recast their derivative verbs on the same thematic model. It is more probable therefore that these verbs were originally thematic, and according to the final vowel of the base appeared as verbs in -ᾶω (as νικάω), -ῆω (as ποθέω), or -ῶω (as δηϊόω). On this assumption, again, the Homeric forms now in question may be variously explained. Where we find η for εε or αε, as in φιλήμεναι, γοήμεναι (instead of the ει, ᾱ required by the ordinary rules), we may suppose, with Wackernagel (*K. Z.* xxvii. 84), that the contraction belongs to an earlier (pre-Hellenic) period. The existence of such a period is proved (e.g.) by the temporal augment, as in ἦ(σ)α for an original ἐ-εσα. Then the participles ἀλιτήμενος, φιλήμενος and the like may be explained by supposing a form in -εμενος, cp. Lat. *leg-imini, docēmini*, so that φιλήμενος would be a primitive contraction from φιλε-έμενος (φιλε-ξε-μενος). The solution however is confessedly incomplete. It does not (directly at least) explain Æolic φίλημεν, φίλεισι, Lat. *amāmus, docēmus, amant, docent*. It only explains the long vowel of φιλή-σω, ἐφιλή-σα, φιλητός, &c., if we also suppose that the -ξε of the Present was carried through all the tenses. And it does not give any satisfactory account of the common contracted forms, νικᾶτε, φιλεῖτε, δηλοῦτε, &c., since these must have come from νικάετε, φιλέετε, δηλόετε, &c. at a period in which the ordinary Greek rules of contraction were in force.

A wholly different explanation is proposed by Brugmann himself (*l. c.*). He shows, as we have seen (§ 14), that there is a large class of non-thematic forms with stems ending in a long vowel—ᾱ, η, ω—which is of the nature of a suffix. Such are ἔ-βλ-η-ν (βῦλ-, βλ-η), ἔ-πτ-η-ν (πετ-, πτ-η), ἔ-γν-ω-ν (γεν-, γν-ω-), and many others, which have their representatives in all languages of the Indo-European family. By an extension of this type has been formed the specifically Greek class of the Passive aorists in -ην, as ἔ-φαν-η-ν, ἔ-τύπ-η-ν and one or two in -ων, as ἔ-άλ-ω-ν.

Similarly, again, the analogy of the 'verbs in -μι,' and especially of those tenses which do not vary the quantity of the stem (as κίχημι, ἄημι, πλῆ-το, ἔγνω) has affected the derivative verbs, and has thus produced the non-thematic forms in question—φιλήμεναι like ἀήμεναι, ἀλιτήμενος like κυχήμενος, and so on. The forms τιθή-μεναι (Il. 23. 83, 247), τιθή-μενον (Il. 10. 34) are probably due to the influence of the same group of Verbs. A similar process explains the Æolic conjugation of verbs in -μι (γέλαιμι, φίλημι, δοκίμωμι), the difference being that in Æolic it was carried much further. In Homer we have nothing answering to the 1 Sing. φίλημι, the 1 Plur. φίλημεν, the 3 Plur. φίλεισι, or the corresponding Imperfect forms.

We cannot be sure, however, that all the examples of this type which appeared in the original text of Homer have been preserved. Wackernagel has observed that nearly all the words now in question are forms which would be unfamiliar in the Greece of classical times. The list is made up chiefly of duals (προσανδήτην, φοιτήτην, &c.) and Infinitives in -μεναι. It is not improbable (e.g.) that the familiar form προσήυδα has supplanted an original Non-Thematic προσήυδη. On the other hand in Il. 11. 638 ἐπὶ δ' αἴγειον κνή τυρόν the metre points rather to the uncontracted κνάε.

20.] Aorists. Of the Aorist Stems noticed in § 13, several are probably derived from Nouns, and do not differ in formation from the Presents discussed in the preceding section: e.g. ἔ-γῆρα (γῆρα-s), βιώ-τω (βίο-s), ἐπ-έπλω-s (πλόο-s), ἀλώ-ναι, perhaps ἀπ-όνη-το. Regarding the Passive Aorists, see §§ 42-44.

21.] Meaning of the Non-Thematic Pres. and Aor. The Presents formed by Reduplication, and by the Suffixes -νῃ and -νυ, are nearly always Transitive or 'Causative' in meaning, as ἵσση-μι, σκιδ-νῃ-μι, ὄρ-νυ-μι: whereas the simpler Verbs, whether Present or Aorist, are usually Intransitive as ἔσση-ν, ἔσβῃ.

Regarding the Tense-meaning, it is enough to point out here that the difference of the Present and Aorist is not given by the form of the Tense: thus the Impf. ἔ-φῃ-ν is the same in formation as the Aor. ἔ-βῃ-ν, ἔ-σση-ν.

The Perfect.

22.] The Perfect-Stem is formed by Reduplication, and is liable to vary with the Person-Endings (§ 6). This variation is the rule in the Homeric Perfect. In Attic it survives in a few forms only; it is regular in οἶδα and ἔστηκα.

The weak form of the Stem is the same (except for the Reduplication) as in the Tenses already discussed. The long Stem is often different, showing a predilection for the O-form.

The variation appears in the interchange of—

(1) η (\bar{a}) and α : as $\tau\epsilon\theta\acute{\eta}\lambda\text{-}\epsilon\iota$ *bloomed*, Part. Fem. $\tau\epsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\text{-}\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$; $\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\rho\epsilon$ *is fitting*, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\alpha}\rho\text{-}\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$; $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\eta\kappa\text{-}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\text{-}\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ *yelling*, $\mu\epsilon\mu\eta\kappa\text{-}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\mu\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\kappa\text{-}\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ *bleating*; $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ ($\lambda\epsilon\lambda\alpha\theta\text{-}\tau\alpha\iota$, $\lambda\acute{\eta}\theta\text{-}\omega$) *has forgotten*, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\chi\text{-}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ *sharpened*, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\nu\text{-}\tau\alpha\iota$ *has appeared*; $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta\pi\epsilon$ *is rotten* ($\sigma\alpha\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$), $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\kappa\alpha$ ($\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\text{-}\omega$), $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\pi\alpha$ (Aor. Part. $\tau\alpha\phi\text{-}\acute{\omega}\nu$), $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\gamma\epsilon$ ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\text{-}\eta$), $\kappa\epsilon\chi\eta\nu\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\eta\gamma\text{-}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\text{-}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\acute{\eta}\chi\text{-}\epsilon\iota$ ($\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\alpha}\chi\text{-}$); $\pi\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\text{-}\mu\eta\nu$ *I had eaten* ($\pi\alpha\tau\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$), $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ($\kappa\acute{\alpha}\delta\text{-}$) *excelling*, $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\text{-}\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ *are sprinkled*, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\alpha\sigma\text{-}\tau\alpha\iota$ *is divided* (but 3 Plur. $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\lambda\text{-}\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, from $\delta\alpha\iota\text{-}$, § 51, 2). In the last four cases the strong form does not actually occur.

$\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\eta\epsilon$ *is on fire* is for $*\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\eta\nu\epsilon$ ($\delta\epsilon\delta\eta\text{f-}\epsilon$): the weak Stem is $\delta\alpha\upsilon\text{-}$ ($\delta\alpha\iota\omega$ for $\delta\alpha\text{f-}\acute{\iota}\omega$, cp. $\kappa\alpha\iota\omega$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\eta\alpha$). Similarly $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\eta\theta\epsilon$ *rejoices* is for $*\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\eta\nu\theta\epsilon$ (Lat. *gaud-eo*).

\bar{a} for η occurs in $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ *is broken* (Hes. Op. 534: $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta$ as Subj. is only Bekker's conj. in Il. 11. 558, see § 67): also in $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\delta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$ *pleasing*, as to which see § 26, 2.

ω and α : this interchange cannot be exemplified from Homer: cp. Attic $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\omega\gamma\alpha$ ($\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\text{-}$, Mid. $\sigma\upsilon\nu\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\eta\kappa\text{-}\tau\alpha\iota$). ω is also found in $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\alpha$ *I bid*, $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu\epsilon$ *calls aloud*, but the corresponding weak Stems are unknown.

(2) ω and ϵ : $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omega\theta\epsilon$ *is accustomed* (cp. $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\omega\nu$, $\acute{\eta}\theta\omicron\varsigma$, root $\sigma\text{f}\eta\theta\text{-}$): $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\text{-}\acute{\omega}\chi\text{-}\alpha\tau\omicron$ *were shut to* (of gates), from $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$: $\sigma\upsilon\nu\text{-}\omicron\chi\omega\kappa\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$ (better perhaps $\sigma\upsilon\nu\text{-}\omicron\kappa\omega\chi\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$, see Cobet, *Misc. Crit.* p. 303) *leaning together*, from $\sigma\upsilon\nu\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ (cp. $\acute{\omicron}\kappa\omega\chi\acute{\eta}$ *a stay or buttress*, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\text{-}\omicron\kappa\omega\chi\acute{\eta}$ = $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\chi\acute{\eta}$ *staying, cessation*).

η and ϵ : in $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\eta\lambda\epsilon$ *is a care*, $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\text{-}\eta\delta\text{-}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ *having eaten*.

(3) ω and \omicron : in $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\text{-}\tau\alpha\iota$ ($\delta\omega\text{-}$), $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\text{-}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\text{-}\tau\alpha\iota$ *is drunk up*, $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omega\lambda\epsilon$ *is lost*, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omega\rho\epsilon$ *is aroused*, $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\pi\alpha$ *I have seen*, $\acute{\omicron}\delta\acute{\omega}\delta\text{-}\epsilon\iota$ *smelt*: perhaps also $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omega}\rho\epsilon\iota$ *watched* (Il. 23. 112 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ δ' $\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omega}\rho\epsilon\iota$ = *was the $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\text{-}\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$*), cp. § 30.

$\pi\rho\omicron\text{-}\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\alpha$ (Il. 1. 113) seems to follow the Pres. $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$: we expect $*\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\omega\lambda\alpha$ ($\beta\omicron\lambda\text{-}$, § 30).

(4) $\omicron\iota$ and ι : $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$, 1 Plur. $\iota\delta\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$; $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\theta\alpha$, 1 Plur. Plpf. $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$; $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\kappa\alpha$, Dual $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\kappa\text{-}\tau\omicron\nu$, Part. Fem. $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\kappa\text{-}\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$; $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\iota\pi\alpha$, Aor. $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\lambda\acute{\iota}\pi\text{-}\omicron\nu$; $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$ *I fear*, for $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\text{f}\omicron\iota\alpha$ (by loss of ι and contraction), 1 Plur. $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$ (for $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\text{f}\iota\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$).

This account of the isolated 1 Sing. $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$ was given by G. Mahlow (*K. Z.* xxiv. 295), and has been adopted by most scholars. The original Homeric form was probably $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\alpha$ (or $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\text{f}\omicron\alpha$), which can be restored in all the passages where the word occurs. Others (as Cobet) would substitute $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\alpha$, a form which is found in several places, sometimes as an ancient v.l. for $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$. But it is difficult on his view to account for the change from $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\alpha$. Rather, an original $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\alpha$ (or $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\text{f}\omicron\alpha$) was altered in two ways, (1) by contraction, which gave it the appearance of a Present in $\text{-}\omega$, and (2) by change of \omicron to ι under the influence of $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$, &c.

(5) *ευ* and *υ*: *πεφευγ-ώς* *having escaped*, Mid. *πεφυγ-μένος*; *τετεύχ-αται* *are made*, 3 Sing. *τέτυκ-ται*; *κέκευθε* *hides* (Aor. *κύθη*); *ἔξευγ-μένοι* *joined* (*ζυγ-όν*). Other weak Stems: *κέχυ-ται*, *ἔσσυ-ται* (§ 15), *πέπυσ-μαι* (*πύθ-*), *κέκλυ-θι* *listen*.

ου interchanging with *υ* is much less common: *εἰλήλουθα* *I am come* (*ἐλῦθ-*), perhaps *δεδουπ-ότος* (cp. *κτύπ-ος*).

υ appears in *μέμυκε* (Aor. *μύκε*), *βέβρυχεν* *roars*, as in the Pres. *μυκάομαι*, *βρύχω*.

(6) *ορ* (*ρο*), *ολ* and *αρ* (*ρά*), *ἄλ* (for *γ*, *ζ*, § 6, 5): *δι-έφθορας* *art destroyed* (*φθάρ-*); *ἔμμορε* *has a share*, Mid. *ἔμμαρ-το* *was apportioned*; *τέτροφε* *is thickened* (*τράφ-*); *ἐπι-δέδρομε* *runs over*; *δέδορκε* *sees*; *ἔοργας* *has done*; *ἐόλπα* *I hope*. Weak forms: *πεπαρ-μένος* *pierced*, *τέτραπ-το* (*τρέπ-ω*), *ἐ-τέγαλ-το* (*τέλλω*).

But *ερ*, *ελ* in *ἐερ-μένος* *strung* (Lat. *sero*), *ἐρχ-αται* *are packed in*, Part. *ἔεργ-μέναι* (*Ἔργ-ω*), and *ἔελ-μένος* *cooped in*: cp. § 31, 6.

ρῖ appears in *βέβριθε* *is heavy*, *ἐρριγα* *I dread*, *πεφρικ-νῖαι* *bristling*, *τετριγ-νῖαι* *chirping*, with no corresponding weak Stem. In these words *ρῖ* seems to come from original *ερ*, *ρ*, or *γ*; cp. § 29, 4.

(7) *ον* and *ᾱ* (for *η*): *γέγονε* *is born*, 1 Plur. *γέγά-μεν*; *πέπονθα* *I suffer*, 2 Plur. *πέπασθε* (for *πεπαθ-τε*), Part. *πεπάθ-νῖα*; *μέμονας* *art eager*, 2 Plur. *μέμᾱ-τε*; *λελόγχ-ᾱσι* *have as portion* (Aor. *ἐλάχ-ον*); *πέφᾱ-ται* *is slain* (*φόν-ος*), *τέτᾱ-ται* *is stretched* (*τόν-ος*), *δεδα-ώς* (§ 31, 5). But we find *αν* in *κεχανδ-ώς* *containing* (Aor. *ἐχᾱδε*).

(8) *ο* and *ε*: as in *τέτοκα* (Hes. Op. 591, cp. Aor. *ἔ-τεκ-ον*); *δέδεγ-μαι* *I await* (cp. *προ-δοκ-αί ambush*); *ἔσ-σαι* *art clothed*; *ἀνήνοθεν* *mounted up* (of a stream of blood, Il. 11. 266), *ἐπ-ενήνοθε* *is upon*: *ἀγηγέρ-ατο* *were assembled* (cp. *ἀγορ-ή*): *κεκοπ-ώς* *striking*. Properly the form with *ο* should interchange with a form without a vowel (*τοκ-* with *τκ-*, &c.), but when this is impossible *ε* remains in the weak Stem: see § 6, 6.

ἀνήνοθε answers in meaning to the Attic *ἀνθέω*, *to be on the surface, come forth upon*: the Pres. would be *ἀνέθ-ω* (related to *ἀνθ-ος* as *ἀλέγ-ω* to *ἀλγ-ος*). So *ἐν-ήνοθε* supposes *ἐνέθ-ω*, weak form *ἐνθ-*.

(9) Stems which take the suffix *κ**.

* A word may be said here on the origin of the Perfects in *-κᾱ*. They may be regarded as formed in the ordinary way from Stems in which a Root has been lengthened by a suffixed *κ*, as in *ὀλέ-κ-ω*, *ἱρύ-κ-ω* (§ 45), *πτήσσω* (for *πτη-κ-ω*, cp. *ἔ-πτα-κ-ον*), *δειδίσσομαι* (for *δει-δφι-κ-ο-μαι*). Thus *ὀλώλεκα* is the regular Pf. of *ὀλέκω*, and *πέπτωκα*, *δείδωκα*, answer to the weak stems *πᾶ-κ*, *δφι-κ*. So *βέβηκα*, *ἔστηκα* answer to (possible) Presents **βή-κω* (cp. *βάκ-τρον*), **στή-κω*. It is not necessary to suppose an actual Stem in *κ* in each case; a few instances would serve to create the type. The reason for the use of the longer Stems *βη-κ*, *στη-κ*, &c., was probably that the forms given by the original Stems were too unlike other Perfects. The characteristic *-ᾱ* would be lost by contraction with the preceding vowels.

When the Stem ends in a vowel, certain forms of the Pf. Act. take κ , thus filling the hiatus which would otherwise be made between the Stem and the Ending: as in $\xi\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\alpha\text{-}\alpha\varsigma$, $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\iota\kappa\alpha$, $\tau\epsilon\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\eta\kappa\alpha\text{-}\alpha\varsigma\iota$. The Perfects of this type—including those of which no forms with κ are actually found—may be divided again into—

(a) Perfects with variable root-vowel: $\xi\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\alpha$ *I stand*, 1 Plur. $\xi\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu$; $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\iota\kappa\alpha$ *I fear*, 1 Plur. $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\mu\epsilon\nu$; $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\upsilon\kappa\epsilon$, 3 Plur. $\pi\epsilon\phi\acute{\upsilon}\alpha\varsigma\iota$; $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\kappa\alpha$, Inf. $\beta\epsilon\beta\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu$; $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\eta\kappa\alpha$, Imper. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\theta\iota$; $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha$, Imper. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\theta\iota$. Add also $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\upsilon\text{-}\kappa\epsilon$ *is closed* (of a wound), $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\upsilon\text{-}\kappa\epsilon$ *is sunk in*, though the short form is not found.

(b) Perfects with invariable long vowel, especially η and ω (discussed in § 14): $\beta\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\iota$ *struck*, Mid. $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\text{-}\tau\alpha\iota$ (cp. $\xi\upsilon\mu\beta\lambda\acute{\eta}\text{-}\tau\eta\nu$, $\beta\lambda\acute{\eta}\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$); $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\mu\eta\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ *art weary*; $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\text{-}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ *brought near*, $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta\text{-}\tau\alpha\iota$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\upsilon\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\mu\eta\text{-}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$; $\beta\epsilon\beta\rho\omega\kappa\omega\varsigma$ *having eaten* (Fut. Mid. $\beta\epsilon\beta\rho\acute{\omega}\text{-}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$), $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\beta\lambda\omega\kappa\epsilon$ *is gone*, $\pi\epsilon\pi\rho\omega\text{-}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ *fated*.

Similarly, from disyllabic Stems, $\delta\epsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\eta\kappa\epsilon$ (Aor. $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\delta\acute{\alpha}\eta\text{-}\nu$) *has learned* (Od. 8. 134), $\tau\epsilon\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\kappa\epsilon$ (Od. 10. 88), and the Participles $\kappa\epsilon\chi\alpha\rho\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\text{-}\nu$), $\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\rho\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\alpha\phi\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$.

To this class belong the Perfects of derivative Verbs in $\text{-}\alpha\omega$, $\text{-}\epsilon\omega$, $\text{-}\omicron\omega$, $\text{-}\upsilon\omega$, as $\beta\epsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$ (Il. 10. 145, 172., 16. 22), $\upsilon\pi\text{-}\epsilon\mu\acute{\nu}\eta\mu\upsilon\kappa\epsilon$ (Il. 22. 491), $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\pi\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$ (Od. 17. 359), $\tau\epsilon\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\eta\kappa\alpha\text{-}\alpha\varsigma\iota$ (Il. 9. 420, 687): $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\omicron\tau\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\omicron\rho\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\text{-}\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$.

$\pi\alpha\rho\text{-}\acute{\omega}\chi\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$ (Il. 10. 252, with v. l. $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}\chi\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$) is formed as if from $\ast\pi\alpha\rho\text{-}\omicron\iota\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, for $\pi\alpha\rho\text{-}\omicron\iota\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$.

$\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\kappa\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ (Od. 12. 281, and four times in Il. 10) means *displeased, disgusted*, and should probably be written $\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\kappa\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, from $\acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (for $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\phi\acute{\alpha}\delta\text{-}\epsilon\omega$).

The Subj. $\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\eta}\kappa\eta\sigma\iota$ (Od. 21. 36), Opt. $\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\iota$ (H. Apoll. 165) point to a Pf. $\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha$ or Pres. $\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\text{-}\kappa\omega$.

(10) A Perfect in $\text{-}\theta\alpha$ may be recognised in $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\eta\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\text{-}\theta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ *keep awake* (Il. 10. 419): perhaps in the Opt. $\beta\epsilon\beta\rho\acute{\omega}\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$ (Il. 4. 35).

In general the Perfects of derivative Verbs are formed with an

It is a confirmation of this view that the Stem with $\text{-}\kappa\alpha$ is in the same form as the Present Stems with a suffixed κ , γ , θ (§ 45), or $\sigma\kappa$ (§ 48).

A similar theory may be formed of the Perfects in $\text{-}\theta\alpha$, of which the germs have been mentioned above. $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\rho\omega\text{-}\theta\alpha$ is related to a Part. $\beta\epsilon\beta\rho\omega\text{-}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ (§ 26, 4) as $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\eta\text{-}\kappa\alpha$ to $\tau\epsilon\theta\upsilon\eta\text{-}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, and to a Mid. $\ast\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\rho\omega\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$ (cp. $\beta\epsilon\beta\rho\acute{\omega}\text{-}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$) as $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\text{-}\kappa\alpha$ to $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$. If in a few more cases, such as $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\rho\tau\text{-}\theta\alpha$ ($\beta\rho\tau\text{-}$), $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\theta\alpha$ ($\sigma\upsilon\acute{\omega}\text{-}\tau\upsilon\varsigma$), $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\eta\text{-}\theta\alpha$ ($\gamma\alpha\phi\text{-}\iota\omega$), we had had short forms of the Stem without θ , the suffix $\text{-}\theta\alpha$ would have been felt to characterise the Pf. Act.; that is to say, the type of the 'Pf. in $\text{-}\theta\alpha$ ' would have been created, and might have spread as the Pf. in $\text{-}\kappa\alpha$ has done.

The Aorists in $\text{-}\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ are to be accounted for in the same way. The κ may be traced in the Pres. $\delta\acute{\omega}\kappa\omega$ (on the inscription of Idalion, see Curt. Stud. vii. 243) and in the Noun $\theta\acute{\eta}\kappa\text{-}\eta$, which points to a Verb-Stem $\theta\eta\text{-}\kappa\text{-}$.

invariable Stem : *α κεκορυθ-μένος, πεπόλισ-το, δδῶδυσ-ται, κεκοιν-μένος*. But no such Perfects are used in the Active.

23.] The Reduplication takes the following forms :—

(1) An initial consonant is repeated with *ε*. This is the general rule : we need only notice the Perfects in which an original consonant has been lost, viz. :—

A labial semi-vowel (*F*) in *ἐ-ελ-μένος* *cooped in* (for *Fe-Feλ-μένος*), *εἰρύαται* (*Feρν-*) *are drawn up*, *εἴλυ-το* (*Feλν-*, *volvo*), *ἐ-οργα* (*Feργ-*ον), *ἐ-ολπα*, *ἔοικα*, Mid. *ἦικ-το* (unless this comes from *ἐῖσχω*).

A sibilant (*σ*) in *ξ-στηκα* (for **σέ-στηκα*), *ἐ-ερ-μένος* *strung together* (Lat. *sero*). But the *σ* is retained in *σέσηπε*.

(2) Stems beginning with two consonants (except when the second is *ρ λ μ* or *ν*), or with *ζ*, usually prefix *ε* only : as *δι-έ-φθορας*, *ἐ-φθίατο*, *ἐ-κτῆσθαι* (but *κέκτημαι*, Hes. Op. 437), *ἐ-ζευγμέναι*. But we find *πε-πτηώς*, *πέ-πτανται*. And in *ἐστηκα* the rough breathing represents original *σ*.

The group *σF* has been lost in *ἐ-ᾰδῶς* (either *σε-σFᾰδῶς* or *ἐ-σFᾰδῶς*) *pleasing*, and *εἴωθα*, *ἔωθα* (Lat. *sue-sco*).

The group *δF* has the effect of lengthening the vowel of the reduplication in *δεῖδοικα*, *δεῖδι-μεν*, &c., which represent original *δέ-δFοι-κα*, *δέ-δFῖ-μεν*, &c.

Initial *ρ*, which generally stands for *Fρ* (sometimes *σρ*), gives *ἐρρ-*, as in *ἐρρηκται* (*Fρηγ-*), *ἐρρίζωται*. Sometimes *εῖρ-*, as *εἴρηται* (*Fρη-*, cp. *ver-bum*), and *εἰρύαται* (*ρύομαι*, *Fρῦ-protect*). One Stem reduplicates *ρ*, viz. *ρε-ρυνωμένα*, from *ρυνῶω*.

Similarly we have *ἐμμορε*, Mid. *εἴμαρ-ται* (*σμαρ-*), and *ἔσσονται* (*σεύω*, root *κειν-* : also *εἴληφα* (post. Hom., cp. *ἐλλαβον*, § 67.)

We must distinguish between (1) phonetic loss, as of *σ* or *F*, and (2) *substitution* of initial *ε-* for the reduplication. The latter may be seen (*e.g.*) in *ἐ-κτῆσθαι*, which cannot be derived by phonetic decay from *κε-κτῆσθαι*. The distinction will serve to explain the difference between *εἴμαρται*, which is the proper representative of an original *σέ-σμαρ-ται*, and *ἐμμορε*, which follows the general tendency to double an initial *μ*, *ν*, *λ* or *ρ* after the augment.

(3) Attic Reduplication ; as *ὄπ-ωπα* *I have seen*, *ἐλ-ήλα-το* *was driven*, *ἐγρ-ήγορα* *I am awake*.

The syllable which follows the Attic Reduplication may vary in quantity, as *ἄρρε*, Fem. Part. *ἀρῤῥνῖα* ; *ἐρήριπε*, Mid. *ἐρέριπτο*. Usually it is long, as *ἐλήλαται*, *ἀρρομένος*, *ἀκηχεμένος*, *δδῶδυσται*, *ἡρήρειστο*, *ἐρήρισται* (Hes. fr. 219), 3 Plur. *ἀγηγέρατο*, *ἐρηρέδαται*, *ὀρωρέχαται*. But it is short in *ἀκάχημαι*, *ἀλάλημαι*.

(4) Temporal Augment (see § 67): e.g. ἐφ-ῆπ-ται (ἄπτω), κατ-ῆκισ-ται (αἰκίζω), ἤσκη-ται (ἀσκέω), ἡσχυμμένος.

(5) In a few cases there is no Reduplication:—

οἶδα, for Φοῖδα, Sanscr. *veda*.

ἐρχ-αται are shut in (Φεργ-), Plpf. ἐρχ-ατο and (with augment) ἐέρχατο.

εἶμαι I am clothed with (Φεσ-), ἔσ-σαι, Plpf. ἔσ-σο, ἔσ-το and (with augment) ἔ-εσ-το, Du. ἔσ-θην, 3 Plur. εἶατο, Part. εἰμένος. Reduplication is not to be found in the εἰ of εἶμαι, εἰμένος, since these are for Φέσ-μαι, Φεσ-μένος (as εἶμα for Φέσμα). The 3 Sing. Pf. occurs once in Homer, in Od. 11. 191, where the best MSS. have ἦσται, others εἶσται and εἶται. The true form is probably ἔσται, preserved in an oracle in Hdt. 1. 47 (cp. ἔσσαι).

ἀμφιαχῦα (Il. 2. 316) crying around can hardly be divided ἀμφ-ιαχῦα, since the Stem ἰαχ- has initial F (§ 390). But a Stem Φηχ- (Φηχῆ cry), weak form Φᾶχ-, without Reduplication would give the Fem. Part. Φᾶχῦα, whence ἀμφι-αχῦα.

These examples make it doubtful whether initial F was originally reduplicated in the Pf. stem. In Sanscr. the roots which begin with *va* (answering to Gr. Φε-) take *u-*, as *uvāca* (vac-, Gr. Φεπ-). Thus the Φε- of ΦέΦοικα, ΦεΦελμένος, &c. may be later, due to the analogy of other Perfects.

δέχ-αται await (Il. 12. 147), Plpf. ἐ-δέγμην (Od. 9. 513., 12. 230), Part. δέγμενος (Il. 2. 794., 9. 191., 18. 524., Od. 20. 385), with the same Pf. meaning that we have in δέδεγμα (await, not receive, § 28): while in other places ἐ-δεκτο, &c. are no less clearly Aorists. It seems that we must recognise a Pf. form *δέγμα (Buttm. G. G. ii. 149., Curt. Verb. ii. 144), probably older than δέδεγμα.

(6) The Reduplication in δει-δέχ-αται they welcome, seems to be that of the 'Intensive' forms, as in δει-δίσκομαι: see § 61. The form belongs to δεικ-νυμι, not δέχ-ομαι (see Veitch).

24.] In the 3 Plur.—

1. The long Stem with -ᾱσι (-a-NTI) is comparatively rare:—

πεποῖθᾱσι (Il. 4. 325), ἐστήκᾱσι (Il. 4. 434, v. l. ἐστήκωσι), κατα-τεθνήκᾱσι (Il. 15. 664), τεθαρσήκᾱσι (Il. 9. 420, 682), ἐγρηγόρθᾱσι (Il. 10. 419).

These forms evidently result from generalising the Stem in -a. So we have οἶδα-s (Od. 1. 337), οἶδᾱ-μεν, οἶδᾱσι in Herodotus (and in Attic, see Veitch s. v.).

2. The final consonant of the Stem, if a labial or guttural, is aspirated before the -ᾱται, -ᾱτο of the Mid.; as ἐπι-τετράφ-αται are entrusted, τετράφ-ατο were turned, ἐρχ-αται (Φεργ-) are shut in, ὀρῶρέχ-αται (ὀρέγ-ω) are stretched out, δειδέχ-αται (δεικ-νυμι)

welcome, κεκρύφ-αται (Hes. Op. 386). The aspirated forms of the Act., such as εἰληφα, κέκοφα, are entirely unknown to Homer.

It has been pointed out by Joh. Schmidt (K. Z. xxviii. 309) that the aspiration in these cases is due to the analogy of the forms in which a similar aspiration is caused by the ending: τετράφ-αται because of the 2 Plur. τέτραφ-θε, Inf. τετράφ-θαι. This explains why a final dental is not affected: for δ before θ passes into σ.

3. An anomalous ε for ι appears in δει-δέχ-αται (δεΐκ-νυμι, see § 23, 6), ἐρ-ηρέδ-αται (ἐρεῖδω, cp. ἡρισ-μένος Hesych.), and ἀκ-ηχέδ-αται (ἀκαχίζω).

4. A final δ of the Stem sometimes appears only in the 3 Plur.: as ἀκηχέδ-αται, ἐρράδ-αται (βαίνω, 1 Aor. βάσσατε), ἐληλάδ-ατο. But the last of these forms is doubtful; it occurs only in Od. 7. 86 χάλκεοι μὲν γὰρ τοῖχοι ἐληλάδατ', where some good MSS. have ἐρρηέδατ'.

25.] **Interchange of Stems.** The original variation between the Strong and the Weak form is disturbed by various causes.

1. The O-form of the Stem is found instead of the weak form in εἰλήλουθ-μεν *we are come* (for εἰλήλυθ-μεν), ἄωρτο *was hung aloft* (cp. ἄερ-θεν), ἐγρήγορθε *keep awake*, with the Inf. ἐγρήγορθαι (Il. 10. 67, cp. ἐγρηγορτί 10. 182); ἄνωγμεν (H. Apoll. 528); cp. ξοιγμεν (in Tragedy), δέδοιγμεν (Et. M.).

2. The strong Stem of the Pres. takes the place of the weak Stem in συν-έρρηκται (Attic ἔρρωγα), λέλειπ-ται, ἐξευγ-μέναι, ἡρήρειστο (ἐρεῖδω); also in ἐερ-μένος, ἐελ-μένος, ἐρχ-αται (§ 22, 6). So κεχανδ-ώς (for κεχᾶδ-ός, χανδάνω).

ἔστητε, commonly read in Il. 4. 243, 246, is an error for ἔστητε: see § 76.

3. The influence of the Present may further be traced in the Perfects which take ι for ει (§ 22, 4), and υ, ευ for ου (§ 22, 5). So ἐδηδ-ός (but ἐδωδή), προ-βέβουλα (βούλομαι).

In all these cases it is worth noticing that the change does not affect the metrical form of the word: e.g. we may read εἰλήλυθμεν, ἔρρακται, ἐζυγμέναι, ἡρήριστο, &c. and some of these may be the true Homeric forms.

The weak Stem appears to take the place of the O-form in δεῖδια (as to which see § 22, 4), and in ἀνα-βέβρυχεν (Il. 17. 54) *gushes up*. For the latter Zenodotus read ἀναβέβροχεν—doubtless rightly, since this is the correct Pf. of ἀνα-βρέχω.

In Attic Reduplication the second vowel of a disyllabic Stem may be short, as in ἐλήλυθα (less common in Homer than εἰλήλουθα), and κατερήριπε (Il. 14. 55).

26.] **The Perfect Participle** was formed originally from the

weak Stem, but there are exceptions in Homer, due partly to the *F* of the Masc. and Neut. Suffix (-*F*ός, -*νία*, -*F*ός), partly to the general tendency to adopt the form of the Sing. Indic. as the Stem. Thus the Homeric Pf. Part. is intermediate between the primitive formation with the weak Stem (as in Sanscrit), and the nearly uniform long Stem of Attic. In particular—

1. When the Ending -ός (-ότος) follows a vowel, one or both of the concurrent vowels may be long: μεμᾶ-ότε, μεμᾶ-ῶτε (both for μεμᾶ-*F*ότε). So γεγᾶ-ῶτας; βεβᾶ-ῶτα; πεφῶ-ῶτε; κεκμη-ῶτας and κεκμη-ῶτα; τεθνη-ότος, τεθνη-ῶτα, also τεθνεῶτι; πεπτη-ότα and πεπτη-ῶτες (πτήσσω): πεπτεῶτα (πίπτω). Both vowels are short in ἐστᾶ-ότος.

ω also appears in τετρίγ-ῶτας (Il. 2. 314), κεκληγ-ῶτας (Il. 16. 430). For the latter there is a v. l. κεκλήγοντας (see § 27); and so perhaps we may read τετρίγοντας.

2. When -ός (-ότος) follows a consonant, the Stem generally takes the long form, as in the Sing. Ind. Act.: ἀρηρ-ός, μεμηκ-ός, λεληκ-ός, εἰικ-ός, πεποιθ-ός, ἐοργ-ός: except εἰδ-ός (οἶδα), εἰκ-ός or εἰκ-ός (Il. 21. 254), ἐᾶδ-ότα (ἄνδαν, root σφαδ-).

As these exceptions show, the strong form is not original: thus εἰδ-ός is for *fid-f*ός, ἐᾶδ-ότα for *isfad-f*ότα. So we have μεμᾶς (perhaps μεμανός), not μεμονός. When *F* was lost the original quantity of the syllable was preserved by lengthening the vowel: and in determining the new long vowel the analogy of the Sing. Ind. naturally had much influence.

3. A long vowel appears in the Feminine εἰδ-νία (Il. 17. 4, elsewhere ἰδνία, Schol. Il. 20. 12), εἰοικ-νία (Il. 18. 418, elsewhere εἰκ-νία)*, τεθνη-νία, πεπληγ-νία, τετρηχ-νία (as Plpf. τετρήχ-ει), βεβρίθ-νία, τετρίγ-νία, πεφρίκ-νία, κεκληγ-νία (Hes. Op. 449). Later forms, ἀρηρ-νία (Hes. Th. 608), τεθηλ-νία (Hom. H. xlviii. 4).

The form βεβῶσα (Od. 20. 14) is an anomaly, apparently formed from the Masc. βεβός on the analogy of Participles in -ούς, -οῦσα and -είς, -είσα.

4. The κ of the Indic. Act. (§ 22, 9) appears in τετυχη-κ-ός (Il. 17. 748), δεδαη-κ-ότες (Od. 2. 61), ἄδη-κ-ότες (Il. 10. 98, 312, 399, 471., Od. 12. 281); and βεβρω-κ-ός (Il. 22. 94., Od. 22. 403). These instances are hardly sufficient to prove that the form is Homeric, since we might read τετυχώς, δεδαηότες, &c. (like κεχαρηώς, κεκοτηώς, &c.) A form βεβρωώς is supported by Attic βεβρωότες (Soph. Ant. 1022). τεθνη-κ-ός (for

* The form εἰοικνία is found in—

καλὴ Κασσιόπεια θεοῖς δέμας εἰοικνία

quoted by Athenaeus xiv. p. 632 as an instance of a line defective in quantity. It does not occur in the text of Homer, but seems to be a variant for Il. 8. 305—

καλὴ Καστιάνειρα δέμας εἰκνία θεῶσιν.

the Homeric *τεθνη-ώς*) is not earlier than Theognis. Similarly *γεγον-ώς* for *γεγαώς* first appears in H. Merc. 17.

5. The form *πεφυζ-ότες flying* (only in Il. 20 and 21), seems to be formed from the noun *φύζα*, without the intervention of any Tense-Stem. This account will apply also to—

κεκοπ-ώς (Il. 13. 60), from *κόπ-ος striking*.

δεδουπ-ότος (Il. 23. 679) *having fallen with a thud*. (The regular form would be *δεδουπη-ώς*, or rather perhaps *ἐγδουπη-ώς*, cp. *ἐ-γδούπη-σαν*.)

ἀρη-μένος, in which the α of *ἀρη* is retained, against analogy.

It is in favour of this view that many Denominative Verbs form the Pf. Part. without the corresponding Indicative, as *κεκοτη-ώς* and the others given above (§ 22, 9). That is to say, the Participle is treated as a derivative *Adjective*, which may be formed independently of the corresponding verb.

27.] **Thematic Perfects.** By this term we understand the forms which arise when a Perfect is inflected like a Present in -ω. This change took place universally in Syracusan Doric, occasionally in other dialects. The chief Homeric instances are as follows:—

ἄνωγα: 3 Sing. *ἀνώγει*, which has a Present sense in several places (though more commonly it is a Plpf.), Dual *ἀνώγε-τον*; also *ἦνωγον*, *ἄνωγον*, *ἄνωγε*, Opt. *ἀνώγοιμι*, Imper. *ἀνωγέ-τω*, *ἀνώγε-τε*. Such a form as *ἦνωγον* may be regarded either as a thematic Plpf. of *ἄνωγα*, or as Impf. of a new thematic Pres. *ἀνώγω*. This remark applies also to the next three cases.

γέγωνα: *ἐγέγωνε*, Inf. *γεγωνέ-μεν* (also *γεγώνειν* or *γεγωνείν*, Il. 12. 337).

πεπληγώς (only in the Part.): *ἐπέπληγον* and *πέπληγον*, Inf. *πεπληγέ-μεν*, Mid. *πεπλήγε-το*. Similarly—

μεμηκώς (Part.): *ἐμέμηκον*.

κεκληγώς: Plur. *κεκλήγοντες* (Il. 12. 125., 16. 430., 17. 756, 759), perhaps *τετρίγοντες* (§ 26, 1), and *κεκόπων* (v. l. for *κεκοπώς*, Il. 13. 60., Od. 18. 335).

μέμνημαι: the Opt. *μεμνέφτο* (Il. 23. 361) is apparently obtained by transference of quantity from a thematic *μεμνή-οιτο*; but we may read *μέμνητο*, 3 Sing. of the regular Opt. *μεμνή-μην* (Il. 24. 745). For this, again, some MSS. have *μεμνοίμην*, as if from **μέμνο-μαι*. The 2 Sing. Ind. *μέμνη* (Il. 15. 18) also points to *μέμνομαι*, but we may read *μέμνη* (*i. e.* *μέμνηται*).

μέμβλε-ται (Il. 19. 343) and *μέμβλε-το* (*μέλ-ω*) may be variously explained. Perhaps *μεμελ-*, the short Stem answering to *μέμηλε*, became by metathesis *μεμλε-*, *μεμβλε-*: cp. *ἤμβροτον* for *ἤμαρτον*.

δῶρε-ται (Od. 19. 377, 524, Subj. *δῶρη-ται* Il. 13. 271).

εἰδήδε-ται (v. l. in Od. 22. 56, see § 25, 3). We may add the

Pluperfects *δειδῖε feared*, ἀήνοθεν (Π. 11. 266); ἐπ-εγήνοθεν (Π. 2. 219., 10. 134): perhaps also the Optatives in -οίμι, -οις, &c. viz. βεβρώθ-οις (Π. 4. 35), βεβλήκοι (Π. 8. 270), πεφεύγοι (Π. 21. 609), ἰλήκοι (H. Apoll. 165); see § 83.

28.] Meaning of the Perfect. The Perfect denotes a lasting condition or attitude (ἔξις). If we compare the meaning of any Perfect with that of the corresponding Aorist or Present, we shall usually find that the Perfect denotes a permanent *state*, the Aor. or Pres. an *action* which brings about or constitutes that state. Thus, δαίω *I kindle*, δέδωκε *blazes*, or (better) *is ablaze*; κῦβε *hid*, κέκευθε *has in hiding*; ὀρ-νν-ται *bestirs himself*, ὄρωρε *is astir*; ὤλε-το *was lost*, ὄλωλε *is undone*; ἤραρε *made to fit*, ἄρραρε *fits* (Intrans.); ταραύσσω *I disturb*, τετρήχει *was in disorder*; μείρο-μαι *I divide*, ἔμμορε *has for his share*; ῥύομαι *I save, shelter*, εἰρύ-αται *keep safe*; τεύχω *I make*, τέ-τυκ-ται *is by making* (not *has been made*); ἐφυ *grew*, πέφυκε *is by growth*.

Thus the so-called *Perfecta praesentia*, βέβηκα, ἔστηκα, γέγηθα, μέμνημαι, πέποιθα, οἶδα, ἔοικα, κέκτημαι, &c., are merely the commonest instances of the rule.

Note the large number of Homeric Perfects denoting attitude, temper, &c. Besides those already mentioned we have—παρ-μέμβλωκε *is posted beside*, δέδορκε *is gazing*, ἔρριγε *shudders*, τέττηκα *I am wasting*, μέμυκε *is closed* (of wounds), δεδάκρυσαι *art in tears*, δέδεξε *be in waiting*, ὀρωρέχατο *were on the stretch*, πεποτή-αται *are on the wing*, κέκμηκα *I am weary*, προβέβουλα *I prefer*, δείδια *I fear*, ἔολπα *I hope*, τέθηπα *I am in amazement*, τέτληκα-ς *thou hast heart*, πέπνυται *has his senses*, δειδέχ-αται *welcome* (in the attitude of holding out the hand, while δεικνύ-μενος denotes the action), together with many Participles—κεχηρνώς *agape*, κεκαφηώς *ranting*, πεπτηώς *cowering*, συν-οχωκότε *bent together*, κεκοτηώς *in wrath*, τετιηώς *vexed*, ἀδηκώς *disgusted*, μεμηλώς *in thought*, πεφυλαγμένος *on the watch*, δεδραγμένος *clutching*, λελιη-μένος *eager*, κεκολωμένος *enraged*, &c. So in later Greek; ἐξην-θηκός (Thuc. 2. 49) *in eruption*, ἔσπουδασμένος *in haste*.

Verbs expressing sustained sounds, esp. cries of animals, are usually in the Perfect: γέγωνε *shouts*, βέβρυχε *roars*, κεκληγώς, λεληκώς, μεμηκώς, μεμυκώς, τετριγώς, ἀμφιαχυία. So in Attic, βοῶν καὶ κεκραγώς (Dem.).

With Verbs of *striking* the Perfect seems to express continuance, and so completeness: κεκοπώς, πεπληγώς, βεβολή-ατο *was tossed about*, βεβλήκει *made his hit*, ἠρήρειστο *was driven home*. (Cp. Ar. Av. 1350 ὅς ἂν πεπλήγῃ τὸν πατέρα νεοττός ὦν.)

Note the number of Imperatives of the Perfect in Homer: τέτλαθι, μέματε, δέδεξε, τέθναθι, δειδιθι, κέκλυθι, ἄνωχθι; Mid. τετύχθω *let it be ordered*, τετράφθω *let him keep himself turned*.

(In later Greek this use seems to be confined to the Middle: *μὴ πεφόβησθε do not be in alarm, πέπασσο keep silence.*)

The number of Homeric Perfects which can be rendered by *have* is comparatively small. The chief instances in the Active are, *ἔοργα-s thou hast done, ὅπωπα I have seen, ἀέλοιπε has left, πέπασθε ye have suffered, ἔδηδ-ώς, βεβρωκ-ώς having eaten*; they are somewhat commoner in the Middle. Yet in the use of these Perfects (and probably in the Perfect of every period of Greek) we always find some *continuing result* implied. There is nothing in Greek like the Latin idiom *fuit Ilium* (= *Ilium is no longer*), *vixi* (= *I have done with living*), &c.

The Intransitive meaning prevails in the Perfect, so that the Act. is hardly distinguishable from the Mid.: cp. *τέτευχε* and *τέτυκται*, *πεφευγώς* and *πεφυγμένος*, *γέγονα* and *γεγένη-μαι*. Compare also the Pf. Act. with the Pres. Mid. in such instances as *ὄλωλα* and *ὄλλυμαι*, *πέποιθα* and *πείθομαι*, *βέβουλα* and *βούλομαι*, *ἔολπα* and *ἐλπομαι*. The forms *τέτροφα*, *ἔφθορα* are Intrans. in Homer, but Trans. in Attic: and an Intrans. or almost Passive meaning is conspicuous in the Homeric group of Participles *κεκοτηώς* *enraged*, *τετιηώς* (= *τετιη-μένος*) *vexed*, *κεκορηώς* (= *κεκορη-μένος*) *satiated*, *βεβαρηώς* *heavy*, *κεχαρηώς* *rejoicing*, *κεκαφηώς* *ranting* (§ 22, 9, b).

Thematic Tenses.

29.] The simple Thematic Present. The Stems which fall under this description generally contain the same vowels (or diphthongs) as the strong Stem of the Non-Thematic Present (§§ 6, 12). They may be classed according to the stem-vowel, as follows:—

(1) *η*, Ionic for *ā*: *λήθ-ε-το forgot, τήκομαι I waste away, θήγει sharpens, σήπεται is rotted, κήδει vexes.*

η: *ἀρήγει helps, λήγει ceases, μῆδεται devises.* The *η* of these Stems is 'pan-Hellenic,' i. e. answers to *η*, not *ā*, in other dialects.

(2) *ει*: *εἶδ-ε-ται seems, εἶκε yield, λείβειν to pour, λείπει leaves, πείθω I persuade, στείβων trod, στείχειν to march, πέλκετε comb, εἵβει drops, φείδω spare, αἶειδε sing, ἀλειφε anointed, ἀμείβε exchanged, ἐρείδόμενος torn, ἐρείδε stayed, ἔρειπε knocked down, νειφόμεν to snow* (so to be read instead of *νιφόμεν* in Il. 12. 280). For *ἴκω I come* the Doric form is *εἴκω*.

(3) *ευ*: *φεύγ-ω I fly, πεύθομαι I learn* (by hearing), *ἐρεύγεται belches, ἐρεύθων reddening, σπεύδω to hasten, ψεύδονται play false, εὐδόμενοι being singed, ἐσσεύοντο were urged on, νεύον noddled, δεύομαι I need*; also, with loss of *υ* before the Thematic vowel, *ἔν-νεον swam* (*νεφ-ον*), *θέει runs, πλέων sailing, πνέει breathes, ῥέει flows, χέει pours, κλέομαι I am famed.*

The forms with *ει* for *ε*, as *θεί-ειν*, *πλείειν*, *πνείων*, *ἐγ-χείη*, (for *θέ-ειν*, &c.) should probably be written with *ευ*, *θεύ-ειν*, *πλεύ-ειν*, &c. See Appendix C.

(4) *ερ* (*ρε*): *δέρκ-ο-μαι* *I behold*, *τέρπειν* *to rejoice*, *πέρθετο* *was sacked*, *ἐέργει* *confines*, *τέρσεται* *is dried*, *ἐρπει* *creeps*, *σπέρχουσι* *urge*, *ἐρρων* *sweeping*, *δέρον* *flayed*, *θέρεσθαι* *to be warmed*, *ῥέπε* *sank downwards*, *ἐπρεπε* *shone*, *τρέπε* *turned*, *τρέφει* *nurtures*, *στρέφει* *twists*.

ελ: *ἐλπ-ο-μαι* *I hope*, *μέλπεσθαι* *to play*, *ἔλκει* *draws*, *ἄμελγε* *milked*, *κέλομαι* *I command*, *πέλει* *turns*, *ἐθέλω* *I am willing*.

ρῖ from *ερ* appears in *τριβ-έμεναι* *to rub* (Lat. *ter-o*), *χρῖ-ον* *anointed* (Sansk. *gharsh-atī*), *βρίθον* *were heavy*.

ῑρ (*ρῖ*, *ρῑ*) for *γ* appears in certain combinations: *κίρ-νημι* (§ 17), *κρίνω*, *κρί-τός* (*cerno*, *certus*), *ρίσα* for *φρδ-ια*, *δρί-ον* for *δρφ-ον* (*drū-s*): *κρίός* (Lat. *cervus*), *κριθή* for *κρσ-θη*, *hordeum*, O. Germ. *gersta* (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 35: Thurneysen, *K. Z.* xxx. 352).

(5) *εν*: *πέν-ε-σθαι* *to labour*, *στένει* *groans*, *μένω* *I wait*, *φθέγγεο* *call out*, *ἐλέγχει* *reproves*, *σπένδων* *making libation*.

εμ: *πέμπω* *I send*, *ἐπι-μέμφομαι* *I blame*, *τέμει* (Il. 13. 707) *cuts*, *δέμον* *built*, *βρέμει* *roars*, *νέμει* *apportions*, *ἐ-τρεμε* *trembled*.

(6) *ε*: *λέγ-ε* *told*, *ἔχ-ω* *I have*, *ἔδει* *eats*, *ἔπεται* *follows*, *πέτεται* *flies*, *δέχομαι* *I receive*, *ἐνν-επε* *say*, *ἐ-στεφε* *set as a covering*; with loss of *σ*, *τρεῖ* (*τρέει*, for *τρεσ-ει*, cp. *ἄ-τρεσ-τος*) *trembles*, *ζεῖ* (*ζέει*) *boils*, *νέομαι* (cp. *νόσ-τος*) *I return*.

The Thematic forms of *εἰμί*, viz. *ξον*, Opt. *ξοί*, Part. *έών*, belong to this head, since *έσ-* is the *strong* stem. So too *κέονται* (for *κει-ονται*), 3 Plur. of *κέυ-μαι*.

ω (instead of *η*) appears in *τρώγ-ειν* *to gnaw* (*τρώγ-*), *διώκειν* *to chase*. Both forms appear to be derivative (with suffixed *γ*, κ, § 45): *τρώ-γω* may be connected with *τορ-εῖν* (§ 31, 4). *διώ-κω* is related to *δίε-μαι* (§ 11): it has been supposed to be a Thematic Perfect, with loss of reduplication (i.e. from **δε-δίω-κα*).

υ appears in *τρύχ-ουσι* *waste away*, *ἀνα-ψύχ-ειν* *to cool*, *ἐρύκ-ει* *restrains*. These also are derivative (§ 45).

ο appears in *λόε* *washed* (Od. 10. 361, H. Apoll. 120), Inf. *λοῦσθαι* (Od. 6. 216). *λο-* is for *λοφ-*, cp. Lat. *lav-ere*. A Pres. **λούω* is inferred from the form *λούεσθαι* (Il. 6. 508 = 15. 265), for which we may read *λοέεσθαι* (from the derivative Pres. *λοέω*).

30.] Thematic Present with weak Stem. Of this formation there are a few instances: *ἄγ-ω* *I drive, bring* (Aor. *ἦγ-ἄγον*), *ἄχομαι* *I am vexed* (Aor. *ἦκ-ἄχε*), *μάχονται* *fight*, *βλάβεται* *fails, breaks down*, *βόλεται* *wishes*, *ὄρονται* *watch*, *ὀθομαι* *I care*, *ἀτεῖς* *dost hear*, *ἀπο-δρύφει* (Opt.) *tear off*, *ἄρχει* *leads*, *ἄγχε* *choked*; also the Thematic forms of *εἶμι*, viz. Impf. *ἦ-ιον*, Opt. *ιοι*, Part. *ιών*.

Note that γράφω is not found in Homer except in the Aor. ἔγραψα.

The forms βόλεται (Il. 11. 319), ἔβλοντο (Od. 1. 234), βόλεσθε (Od. 16. 387) were restored by Wolf: see Buttmann's Lexil. s. v.

The form βλάβεται (Il. 19. 82, 166, Od. 13. 34) occurs in gnomic passages only, where an Aorist would be equally in place (§ 78, 2).

δρονται (Od. 14. 104), δροντο (Od. 3. 471) occur in the phrase ἐπὶ δ' ἀνέρες ἔσθλοι δρονται, where ἐπὶ δρονται seems to be = 'act as ἐπίουροι,' 'are in charge.'

ἄω only occurs as a Pres. in the phrase οὐκ αἴεις; = have you not heard? Elsewhere ἄων is used as an Aorist (Schulze, K. Z. xxix. 249).

A Pres. δρύφω cannot be inferred with certainty from the Opt. ἀποδρύφωι (Il. 23. 187., 24. 21), which may be an Aorist.

The forms ἀρχω, ἄγχω are difficult because original ἀρχ-, ἀγχ- would shorten the vowel (before a semi-vowel and mute), and consequently the Stem would be indistinguishable from original ἀρχ-, ἀγχ-. That in ἀρχ-ω the Stem is weak may be inferred from the Nouns ἀρχ-ός, ἀρχ-ή (§ 109): the O-form may be found in ἀρχαμος, the strong form possibly in ἐρχ-ομαι. Again ἄγχ-ω may be identified with Sanscr. āh-ati (for ṛgh-ati): the strong form being ἐγχ- in ἐγχ-ελυς (De Saussure, Mém. p. 276 ff.).

31.] The Thematic Aorist. The Verb-Stem is in the weak form: we may distinguish the following groups:—

(1) With ᾱ as Stem vowel (the strong Stem with ᾱ or η): λάθε was unseen by, λάκε crackled, ἔλ-λαβε took, εὐαδε (for ἔ-σφᾶδε) pleased, μακῶν bellowing, φάγον ate, δι-έ-τμαγον (τμήγω) parted, ἀν-έ-κραγον cried aloud (Attic Pf. κέκρᾶγα), ἀρετο gained, ἄληται (Subj.) shall leap, ἔ-χραε assailed (χρᾶν-), δάηται (Subj.) shall be burned (δᾶν-), φάε shone (φᾶν-, cp. πιφᾶνσκω), λάε seized, pinned (λᾶν-, cp. ἀπο-λαύω), ἄλθετο was healed, ἤλφον (Opt. ἄλφοι) earned, ἦντετο met (Part. ἀντ-όμενος).

The forms φάε (Od. 14. 502) and λάε, Part. λᾶων (Od. 19. 229, 230) are placed here provisionally. Each occurs once, in a context which does not decide between Aor. and Impf.

The existence of an Aor. ἔ-φαχ-ον has been made probable by W. Schulze (K. Z. xxix. 230). He shows that the form ἴαχον, generally taken as the Impf. of ἴαχω (§ 35), is an Aor. in meaning, and constantly occurs after elision (μέγ' ἴαχον, ἐπὶ δ' ἴαχον, ἐπ-ἴαχον). Consequently we can always read φάχον (μέγα φάχον, ἐπὶ δὲ φάχον, ἐπὶ-φαχον), or with augment εὔαχον (cp. εὔαδε for ἔ-φαδε). In Il. 20. 62 καὶ ἴαχε would be read καὶ εὔαχε. The alternative is to suppose that ἐ-φῖ-φαχον became εἰαχον by loss of f and contraction (Wackernagel, K. Z. xxv. 279): but contraction in such a case is very rare in Homer, and the Aor. meaning of ἴαχον has to be accounted for. On the other hand if we accept Schulze's view we have still to admit a Pres. (or Aor.?) Participle ἰάχων (φῖ-φάχων).

(2) With ε (strong η): ἔθων doing as he is wont (cp. ἦθ-ος for σφῆθ-ος), perhaps μέδ-οντο bethought them (μήδ-ομαι).

The forms μέδοντο, &c. are generally referred to a Verb μέδομαι: but no such Present is found, and the other Moods—Subj. Opt. Imper. and Inf.—always admit the Aor. meaning. As to ἔθων see § 243, I. If an Aor. it should be accented ἐθών.

(3) With ἰ (strong ει): ἔ-στῖχ-ον (στείχω) *marched*, ἐ-πίθοντο *obeyed*, ἰκέσθαι *to come to*, λιτέσθαι *to entreat*, ἤριπε (ἐρείπω) *fell down*, ἤρικε (ἐρείκω) *was torn*, ἤλιτεν *offended* (Mid. ἀλιτέσθαι), ἄϊον *heard*, δίε *feared* (δφι-), δίον *ran*, ἐ-κίον *moved*, ἐ-πίον *drank*, ὄλισθε *slipped*, κρίκε *cracked*.

With αι, αἰθόμενον *burning*, αἶδετο *felt shame* (§ 32, 2); ἔχραισμε *availed* (§ 32, 3).

δίον *I ran* (Il. 22. 251) is not to be connected with δίε *feared*, but with ἐν-δίε-σαν, διέ-νται *chase*, of which we have the Thematic Subj. δῖωμαι, Opt. δίοιτο, Inf. διέσθαι. That they are Aorists appears (e.g.) from Il. 16. 246 ἐπεὶ κε δῖηται *when he shall have chased*.

ἐκίον is probably an Aor., since *κίω does not occur. The accentuation of the Part. κίων is in favour of this, but not decisively (cp. ἐών, ἰών).

(4) With ῥ (strong ευ): κύθε *hid*, φύγον *fled*, τύχε *hit upon*, πυθόμην *I heard tell*, ἔστνυγον *felt disgust*, ἔκτυπε *sounded*, ἤρυγε *bel-lowed*, ἤλυθον *I came*, ἔκλυον *heard*, ἄμ-πννε *recovered breath*.

With αυ, αὔε *shouted*, αὔη (Subj.) *kindle*, ἐπ-αυρεῖν *to gain from*, *enjoy*. With ευ, εὔρε *found*.

ἐκλυον is clearly an Aor. in Homer. The Pres. κλύω, which occurs in Hesiod (Op. 726 οὐ γὰρ τοί γε κλύουσιν) and in Attic poets, is perhaps only a mistaken imitation of the Homeric style.

(5) With ἄρ, ρά, ρ (strong ερ, ρε): ἐ-πράθ-ο-μεν (πέρθ-ω) *we sacked*, κατ-έδραθον *went to sleep*, ἐ-δρακον (δέρκομαι) *looked*, ἔδραμον (δρόμος) *ran*, ἐ-τραπον *turned*, ἔτραφε (τρέφω) *was nurtured*, ταρπώ-μεθα (τέρπω) *let us take our pleasure*, ἔβραχε *rattled*, ἄμαρτε (also ἡμβροτε) *missed*, ἔπταρε *sneezed*, ἔγρ-ετο (ἐγερ-) *was roused*, ἀγρ-όμενοι (ἀγερ-) *assembled* (§ 33).

With ἄλ, λ (strong ελ): ἐ-βαλ-ον (βέλ-ος), ἐ-πλ-εν, ἔπλετο *turned, came to be* (§ 33).

With ορ, ολ: ἐ-πορ-ον *furnished*, ἔθορε *leaped*, ἔτορε *pierced*, ὄρετο *was stirred up*, ἐκ-μολ-ε *came out*, ὀλέσθαι *to perish*.

The ε of the strong Stem appears in εἶλον, ἔλ-ον *took*, ἐρ-έσθαι *to ask* (cp. § 22, 6).

It will be seen that ἄρ, ρά, ἄλ are generally placed between consonants, where ρ, λ would be unpronounceable. The only exceptions are, ἔπαρον and ἔβαλον. On the other hand ορ, ολ only appear before a vowel.

(6) With ἄ (strong εν, εμ): ἐ-παθ-ον (πένθ-ος) *suffered*, μάθ-ον *learned*, ἔλαχον *obtained as share*, ἔχαδε (Fut. χέισσμαι) *contained*, δακείν *to bite*, δάηται *shall learn* (δᾶσ-, strong form *δενσ-, cp. δέδαεν, § 36, 5).

ἄν, ἄμ (before a vowel): ἔ-κταν-ον *killed*, ἔθανε *died*, ἔ-καμ-ον *wearied*, τάμε *cut* (cp. ἔ-δάμ-η, § 42).

εἶν appears in γεν-έσθαι *to become*.

(7) With loss of ε: ἔ-σχ-ον *held* (ἔχ-ω for σέχ-ω), ἔσπετο *followed*, Inf. ἐπι-σπένσθαι (ἐπομαι for σεπ-ομαι), ἐπι-πτένσθαι (πετ-) *to fly over*, ἔξετο *sat* (for ἔ-σδ-ετο, Ahrens, *Gr. F.* § 95).

The ε is retained in ἔ-τεκ-ον *brought forth*, ἀπ-εχθ-έσθαι *to incur hatred*, ἔσχεθον *held* (?). In these cases loss of ε is phonetically impossible.

ἀπ-ήχθε-το is an Aor. in Homer (the Pres. being ἀπ-εχθάνο-μαι), although a Present ἔχθο-μαι is found in Attic. The simple ἤχθετο (Od. 14. 366, ἔχθεσθαι Od. 4. 756, ἔχθόμενος Od. 4. 502) is called Impf. by Veitch; but the meaning in the three places seems to be the same as in ἀπ-ήχθετο—not *was* hateful, but *came to be hated*.

The only ground for taking ἔσχεθον to be an Aor. is the Inf. σχεθῆειν (Il. 23. 466, Od. 5. 320). Possibly this may be a Pres. Inf. in -εειν (§ 85, 2), preserved owing to the impossibility of σχίθειν in the hexameter.

32.] The foregoing list calls for some further remarks.

1. Comparing the Second Aorists of later Greek, we are struck by the number of instances in Homer in which the Thematic ε or ο follows another vowel.

In ἔχραε, φάε, λάε, δάηται (for ἔ-χρᾱF-ε, φᾱF-ε, λᾱF-ε, δᾱF-ηται) the hiatus is due to the loss of F. So in λóε (for λóFε). Similarly σ is lost in δάηται (δᾱσ-) *shall learn*.

In several cases the Thematic inflexion is found intermingled with Non-thematic forms. Thus we have ἔκλυον, Imper. κλῦθι; ἄμ-πνυε, Mid. ἄμ-πνῦ-το; ἔπιον, Imper. πῖθι (Ar. Vesp. 1489); δίον *I ran*, ἐν-δίε-σαν *chased* (δίη-μι). The presumption is that the Non-thematic forms are older, the others being derived from them as ἔον *I was* and ἦιον *I went* from corresponding parts of εἰμι, εἶμι (cp. § 18). Similarly we may account for ἔκιον (κί- in Pres. κί-νυμαι), and perhaps δέε *feared*, ἄιον *heard*.

2. Another characteristic group is formed by the Aorist Stems in which we find initial α either entering into a diphthong (αἰ-, αὐ-) or followed by a double consonant: viz. αἰθ-, αἰδ-, αὐ- (in αῦε), αὐ- (in αῖη *kindle*), αὐρ-, ἀλθ-, ἀλφ-, ἀντ-. Some of these which are usually counted as Present Stems require separate notice:—

αἰθ- occurs in Homer only in the Part. αἰθόμενος *burning*: as to the adjectival use of Participles see § 244. The Stem is found in the Sanscr. *idh-ati burns*.

αἰδ- occurs in the Indic. αἰδετο, Imper. αἰδεο, Part. αἰδόμενος; the corresponding Pres. is always αἰδέομαι.

αῦε *shouted* may always be an Aor. (Il. 11. 461., 13. 477., 20.

48, 51). We may identify this *αὖ-* with *u* in Sanscr. *u-noti calls*. The *α-* is a distinct syllable in the Aor. *ἄῤ-σε*, ep. *ἄῤῆ*.

αῦη (Od. 5. 490, v. l. *αῦοι*) makes good sense as an Aor., expressing the *act* of kindling. The Stem is weak (*αῦα-* = Sanscr. *ush-* in *ush-ás*, Æol. *αῦω*); the strong form appears in *εὔ-ω*, Lat. *uro*.

ἐπ-αυρεῖν exhibits the Thematic form answering to *ἀπ-ήνυρα*, *ἀπο-υράς* (§ 13).

ἄλθ-ετο, found only in Il. 5. 417, is clearly an Aor.

ἄλφ- occurs in *ἡλφον*, Opt. *ἄλφοι*, with Aor. meaning.

ἀντ- in *ἦντετο*, *συν-αντέσθην*, Inf. *ἀντέσθαι*, Part. *ἀντόμενος*, always with clear Aor. meaning. Accordingly *ἀντέσθαι* in Il. 15. 698 (the only place where it occurs) was accented by Tyrannio *ἀντέσθαι*.

The *α-* of *αἰθ-*, *αῦσ-*, &c. is discussed by De Saussure along with that of *ἀρχ-*, *ἄγχ-* in a passage quoted above (§ 30 note). He regards it as 'prothetic,' so that the Stems in which it appears are generally in the *weak* form. The *-ῥ* of *αῦ-* may answer to either *ῑ* or *ευ* in the strong form; thus *αῦδ-ή*: *ἄφειδ-ω* = *αῖψ*: *ἄφειζ-ω* (Sanscr. *vaksh-*) = *αὔχ-ή*: *εὔχ-ομαι*, perhaps *ἐπ-αυρεῖν*: *εὔρ-εῖν*. A similar *α-* appears in *ἀ-μείβω*, *ἀ-μέλγω*, *ἀείρω*; perhaps in *ἀ-λιτέσθαι*, *ἀ-μαρτεῖν* (but in these it may be originally significant, *infra*, 3).

In *ἄλθ*, *ἄλφ*, *ἀντ-* the form is weak (perhaps *ἄλθ-* is to a strong *ἄλεθ-* as *ἄλγ-ος*: *ἄλέγ-ω* or *ἄλκ-ή*: *ἄλεκ-* in *ἄλέξω*), or else the strong and weak forms coincided (as in *ἐρχ*, *ἄγχ*, § 30).

It appears then that in the Tenses with which we are dealing the strong Stem has generally disappeared, and the Present has been derived afresh from the weak Stem, by means of one of the various Suffixes. Thus we have *αἰδ-*, Pres. *αἰδ-έομαι*; *αῖε*, Pres. *αῖτέω*; *αῦρ-*, Pres. *ἐπ-αυρ-ίσκω*; *ἀντ-*, Pres. *ἀντιάω*, *ἀντιάζω*. The process has been the same in *ἀλιτ-έσθαι* and Pres. *ἀλιτ-αίνω*, *ἀμαρτ-εῖν* and *ἀμαρτ-άνω*, *εὔρ-εῖν* and *εὔρ-ίσκω*, *ἐχθέσθαι* and *ἀπ-εχθ-άνομαι*, *ὀλισθεῖν* and *ὀλισθ-άνω*, also in Attic *αλσθ-έσθαι* and *αλσθ-άνομαι*. The last is interesting as the only post-Homeric Second Aorist which is used in good Attic prose.

3. A few Thematic Aorists seem to be formed from the Stems of Nouns of the O-declension. Thus *ἐχραισμε* *availed* is generally derived from *χρήσιμος* *useful* (Curt. *Verb.* ii. 13). So, according to Curtius, *θέρμε-τε* *warm ye*, *θέρμε-το* *grew warm*, from *θερμός*; *ὀπλε-σθαι* (Il. 19. 172., 23. 159) *to get ready*, from *ὀπλον* (*ὀπλέ-ω*); *γόον* (Il. 6. 500) *bewailed*, from *γόος* (*γο-άω*); *ἀμαρτ-εῖν* *to miss*, from *ἀμαρτ-ο-* *without part in*.

Some at least of these instances may be otherwise explained. For *ὀπλεσθαι* we may read *ὀπλείσθαι* (the uncontracted *ὀπλέεσθαι* is impossible in the hexameter). *γόον* in Il. 6. 500 *αἱ μὲν ἔτι ζῶν γόον* 'Εκτορα κ. τ. λ. makes better sense as an Impf.: Fick reads *γόαν*, 3 Plur. of an 'Æolic' *γόημι*. Possibly *γούον* is for *γόεον* by hyphaeresis (§ 105, 4).

33.] In several cases it is difficult to say whether loss of *ε* is characteristic of an Aor. Stem, or is merely phonetic, due to

'syncope.' Thus we have ἀγέροντο, Part. ἀγρόμενοι: ὄφελον *ought* and the Attic ὄφλον *owed*: πέλω and the syncopated forms ἐπλεν, ἐπλετο, Part. ἐπιπλόμενος, &c. (not ἐπελεν, ἐπέλετο, &c. in Homer).

ἀγέροντο *were assembled*, Inf. ἀγέρεσθαι (so accented in MSS.) imply a Pres. ἀγέρω; but the Part. ἀγρ-όμενοι seems to be an Aor. The ε is only lost in the Part., whereas in the undoubted Aor. ἐγρ-ετο the form ἐγερ- never occurs (Opt. ἐγροίτο, Inf. ἐγρεσθαι). In Il. 7. 434., 24. 789 ἀμφὶ πυρῇν . . . ἐγρετο λαός Cobet (*Misc. Crit.* p. 415) proposed to read ἤγρετο, from ἤγερ-. The emendation gives a good sense, but is not absolutely necessary.

ὄφελον *ought* (= *would that*) bears a different sense from the Aor. ὄφλον, but is indistinguishable from the Impf. ὄφελλον (Od. 8. 312 τῷ μὴ γέινασθαι ὄφελλον, so Il. 7. 390., 24. 764, Od. 14. 68., 18. 401). Hence ὄφελον is probably an older form of the Imperfect which has survived in this particular use.

ἐπλεν, ἐπλε-το, &c. must be Aorists, since—

(1) ἐπλετο occurs in the 'gnomic' use, e.g.—

Il. 2. 480 ἦντε βοῦς ἀγέληφι μέγ' ἔξοχος ἐπλετο πάντων
and so in Il. 24. 94, Od. 7. 217. This use is not found with the Impf.

(2) ἐπλετο with the meaning of a Present can only be explained as an Aor. = the English Pf., *has turned out, has come to be, (and so is)*: see § 78, and cp. Il. 12. 271 νῦν ἐπλετο ἔργον ἀπάντων νοιο *it has become*: with another Aor. similarly used, Il. 15. 227 πολλὸν κέρδιον ἐπλετο, ὅτι ὑπόβειξεν *it is better that he has yielded*: also Il. 6. 434., 7. 31., 8. 552., 14. 337., 19. 57, Od. 20. 304, &c.

The Part. occurs in ἐπι-πλόμενον ἔτος (Od.) and περι-πλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν, with much the same force as the Pres. Part. in the equivalent phrase περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν. But, as we shall see, an Aor. Part. may have the meaning of an adjective (§ 244): cp. *volvenda dies*.

34.] Comparison of the Thematic 'Strong' Aorists found in Homer with those of other periods of Greek brings out strikingly the relation between the Homeric and the later dialect.

It may be assumed that the Strong Aorists, like the Strong Preterites in English, were a diminishing class, never added to (except by learned imitators of the Epic style), and gradually superseded by the more convenient forms in -σα. Hence the comparative frequency of these Aorists in an author indicates either an early date or (at least) the use of an archaic style.

Curtius enumerates altogether 117 Strong Aorists, of which 84 are found in Homer. Of these 84, again, about 30 occur also in prose, while as many more are used in the later poetical style (ἐλακον, ἔκιον, ἔκλυον, μολεῖν, πορεῖν, &c.). Of the non-Homeric examples only one, viz. αἰσθῆσθαι, belongs to the language of prose; about 15 are found in good early poetry (e.g. δικάειν, θιγείν, κανεῖν, βλαστεῖν, in Attic dramatists); most of the others are evidently fignments of learned poets, imitated from actual Homeric forms, e.g. ἔδαεν (from Homeric δέδαεν), ἔμμορον (from μόρος and the Homeric Pf. ἔμμορε), ἔδουπε.

These facts seem to show both the high antiquity of the Homeric language and the position which it held as the chief though not the only source of the poetical vocabulary of historical times.

35.] The Reduplicated Thematic Present. This formation appears in a few instances only :—

μῖ-μν-ετε *await* (μέν-ω).

πίπτε *fell* (πετ-).

ἴσχει *holds*, for *σι-σχ-ει, from *σεχ-.

ἴζει *sits*, for *σι-σδ-ει, from σεδ-.

γίγνεται *becomes* (γεν-).

τίκτω, for τι-τκ-ω, from τεκ-.

νίσσμαι *I go, pass*, for νι-νσ-ομαι, or νι-νσ-ιο-μαι, from νεσ- : related to νέομαι (§ 29, 6) as ἴσχω to ἔχω.

δίξε *sought* (Thematic form answering to διζή-μαι, § 16).

λαύ-εις *sleepiest* (Aor. ἄεσα, for ἀφε-σα, *I slept*, cp. αὔξω and ἀέξω).

In this group of Verbs the Root is in the weak form; the vowel of the reduplication is always ι.

ιάω (for Fi-Fάχω) is generally placed in this class. The Pres. Indic. does not occur, and the past Tense ἴαχον is an Aor. in Il. 5. 860., 14. 148., 18. 219 ὅτε τ' ἴαχε σάλπιγγ' (§ 79), and may always be so in Homer. As to its original form see § 31, 1, *note*. Thus the evidence for ἴάω is reduced to the Part. ἴαχων, and that is not used in a way that is decisive between the Pres. and the Aor.

36.] The Reduplicated Aorist. These Tenses are formed with the weak Stem, and either (1) reduplication of an initial consonant with ε, or (2) Attic Reduplication. The following are the chief examples :—

(1) ἄ : ἐκ-λέλαθ-ον *made to forget*, λελαβέσθαι *to seize*, κεκαδών *severing*, κεκάδοντο *yielded*, κεχάροντο *rejoiced*, ἄμ-πεπαλὼν *brandishing on high*, τεταγών *grasping*, ἦγ-αγ-ον *led*, ἐξ-ήπαφε *deceived*, ἦραρε *fitted*, ἦκαχε *vexed*.

(2) ι : πεπίθ-οιμεν *may persuade*, πεφιδέσθαι *to spare*.

(3) υ : τετύκ-οντο *made for themselves*, πεπύθοιτο *may hear by report*, κεκύθωσι *shall hide*.

(4) ᾗρ (ρᾷ), ᾗλ, λ : τετάρπ-ετο *was pleased*, πέφραδε *showed forth*, ᾗλ-αλκε *warded off*, ἐ-κέ-κλ-ετο *shouted* (κελ-).

(5) ᾗ, ν (for εν) : λελάχ-ητε (Subj.) *make to share*, δέδαεν *taught* (cp. § 31, 5); ἔ-πε-φν-ε *slew* (cp. πέ-φᾶ-ται *is slain*).

(6) Loss of ε : ἔ-τε-τμε *found, caught* (τεμ-?); ἔειπον *said* (perhaps for ἐ-φε-φεπ-ον)*; also ἔσπετο *followed*, if it is taken to be for σέσπε-το.

* The difficulty in the way of this explanation is that in the old Attic inscriptions which distinguish the original diphthong εα (written EI) from the sound arising from contraction or 'compensatory' lengthening (written E), the word εἶπε is always written with EI (Cauer in *Curt. Stud.* viii. 257). In Sanscr. the corresponding form is *avocam*, for *a-va-vac-am* (*vāc* becoming *uc*). Answering to this we expect in Greek *ἐυπον* (Vogrinz, *Gr. d. hom. Dial.* p. 123).

The forms which point to *σε-σπε-το, viz. ἔσπονται (Od. 12. 349), ἐσποίμην (Od. 19. 579., 21. 77), ἐσπέσθω (Il. 12. 350, 363), ἐσπόμενος (Il. 10. 246., 12. 395., 13. 570), can be easily altered (e.g. by writing ἄμα σποίμην for ἄμ' ἐσποίμην). We always have ἐπι-σπέσθαι, ἐπι-σπόμενος, μετασπόμενος (never ἐφ-εσπόμενος, &c.); i.e. ἐσπ- only creeps in when a preceding final vowel can be elided without further change.

(7) A peculiar Reduplication is found in ἡρύκακε (Pres. ἐρύκ-ω) *checked*, and ἡνίπαπε (ἐνιπή) *rebuked*.

These Aorists are exclusively Homeric, except ἤγαγον and ἔειπον (Attic εἶπον). They are mostly Transitive or Causative in meaning; compare ἔ-λαχο-ν *I got for my share*, with λέλαχο-ν *I made to share*; ἄρπεε *is fitting*, with ἤραρε *made to fit*, &c.

The Inf. δεδάσθαι (Od. 16. 316) is not to be connected with the Perf. Part. δεδα-ώς, but is for δεδαέσθαι, Inf. Mid. of the Reduplicated Aorist ἐδέαεν *taught*. Thus the sense is *to have oneself taught*.

37.] **Aorists in -ᾱ.** Besides the usual forms of ἔ-ειπο-ν (εἶπο-ν) we find a 2 Sing. εἶπα-ς (Il. 1. 106, 108), or ἔ-ειπα-ς (Il. 24. 379), 2 Plur. εἶπα-τε (Od. 3. 427). Answering to the Attic ἤνεγκον Homer has ἤνεικα, Opt ἐνείκα-ι, &c.: but Inf. ἐνεικέ-μεν (Il. 19. 194).^{*} In these two cases the form in -ον is probably older.

Tenses with Suffix (Non-Thematic).

38.] The Tense-Stems which remain to be discussed are formed (like the Presents in -νῆμι and -νῦμι) by means of a characteristic Suffix. Of these Tense-Stems three are Non-Thematic, viz. those of the Aorists formed by the Suffixes -σᾱ, -η, and -θη.

It is important to notice the difference between these formations and the Perfect and Aorist Stems which take -κᾱ. The Suffix -κᾱ in such cases is not characteristic of the Tense-Stem. It is only found as a rule with certain Person-Endings.

39.] **The Aorist in -σᾱ** (called 'Sigmatic' and 'Weak*' Aor.). The Suffix -σᾱ is joined to the Verb-Stem (usually in its strong form), as ἔρρηξε (ῥηγ-), ἤλειψα-ν (ἄλειφ-), ἔπνευ-σα-ν (πνευ-), ἔδεισε (for ἔ-δφει-σε) *feared*, ἔ-βη-σᾱ-ν, ἔ-φῦ-σᾱ.

The following are the chief varieties:—

1. Verb-Stems ending in a Dental or σ, preceded by a short vowel, form -σᾱ or -σᾱ: thus we have ἤρεσσα and ἤρεσα (for ἡ-ρετ-σα, from ἔρετ-); ἔσ-σατο, ἔσασθαι (ἔεσ-); σβέσ-σαι, τρέσ-

* The term 'Weak' implies formation by means of a Suffix. It was suggested by the analogy between the two Aorists and the Strong and Weak Preterites of the Teutonic languages.

σαι; ἔσας, ἐφ-έσσα-το (ἐδ- for *σεδ-); ἔ-θλασε and θλάσ-σε, σπάσα-το, ἐ-δάσ-σα-το, ἐσ-ε-μάσ-σα-το, νάσ-σα (§ 51, 2); χάσسا-το (cp. ἔ-χαδε), ἐ-φρασά-μην (φράδ-), ῥάσσα-τε (ῥᾶδ-), πασά-μην (πᾶτ-); ἔλλισά-μην (λῖτ-), ὠδύσα-το (ὀδυσ-).

Verbs in -ζω form the Aorist in this way, as ὠπασα, ἐκόμισσα, ξείνισεν, ἤρμοσε; or (less commonly) in -ξᾶ, as ἐξενάριξα, δαίξαι, μερμήριξε, ἐγγυάλιξε. ἀρπάζω forms ἤρπαξε and ἤρπασε.

2. Derivative Verbs in -αω, -εω, -οω, -υω usually form the Aor. with a long vowel (in -ησα, -ωσα, -υσα). But the Verbs in -εω often form the Aor. in -εσσα, -εσα; not only the Verbs derived from Noun-Stems in -εσ, such as τελέω, νεικέω, ἀκηδέω, but also several Verbs derived from Masc. Nouns in -ο-ς; e.g. ἐκορέσ-σατο *was satiated* (Pf. κεκορη-μένος), κοτέσ-σατο *was enraged* (κεκοτη-ώς), πόθεσαν *longed for* (ποθή-μεναι), ἄλεσαν *ground*.

Other examples of σσ in the Aor., though the Verb-Stem cannot be shown to end in σ or a Dental, are: ἡγάσσοτο (ἄγα-μαι) *was amazed*, ἐτάλα-σσα *endured*, κέρα-σσε *mixed*, πέρα-σσα *sold*, ἦλα-σσα *drove*, ἦρα-σάμην *loved*, ἐδάμα-σσα *tamed*, ἰλά-σσονται (Subj.) *shall appease*, καλέ-σσαι *to call*, ὀλέ-σσαι *to destroy*, ἐτάνυ-σσα *stretched*, ἐκάπυ-σσε *panted*, ἐρύ-σσαμεν *drew*, ἄε-σα *slept*, λοέ-σσατο *washed*, ὀμό-σαι *to swear*, ὀνό-σσατο *made light of*; see § 51. Note that when -σα is preceded by a short vowel there is always a collateral form in -σσα: the only exceptions are στορέ-σαι *to strew* and κρεμά-σαι *to hang*, and these are due to metrical reasons.

Most of the Aorists in -ᾶσσα, -εσσα, &c. are evidently due to the analogy of those in which -σα was originally preceded by a short vowel and a dental or σ. That is to say, ἐτάλα-σσα, ἐκάλε-σσα, &c. do not follow the type of ἔρρηξα, ἡλείψα (as ἔβη-σα, ἐφῶ-σα did), but the type of ἔθλασ-σα, ἐτέλεσ-σα. Thus -σσᾶ becomes the Tense Suffix after a short vowel, just as -σᾶ is after a long vowel or diphthong.

The forms λούσε, λούσαι, λούσαντο, λούσασθαι, &c., which suppose an Aor. *ἔ-λου-σα can nearly always be written λοε-. The exceptions are, Π. 14. 7 *θερμήνη καὶ λούση ἀπο βρότον* (read λοέση τε ἀπὸ), Od. 6. 210 *λούσατέ τ' ἐν ποταμῷ*, 6. 219 *ἀπολούσομαι*.

3. With Verb-Stems ending in μ, ν, ρ, λ, the σ is usually lost, and the preceding vowel lengthened, ε becoming ει: as ἔ-γημα (γαμ-), κρηῆναι (κρᾶν-, § 55), ἐπ-έ-τειλα (τελ-), ἐ-φίλα-το (φῖλ-), ἡγεῖρα (ἔγερ-), χήρα-το (χαρ-)*. A few Stems retain σ: ὠρ-σα, ἄρ-σαι, ἀπό-ερ-σε, ἔ-κερ-σε, κύρ-σα-ς, φύρ-σα-ν, ἔλ-σα-ν, κέλ-σαι, κένσαι. This is the rule when ρ or λ of the Stem is followed by a dental, as in ἔ-περσε (for ἔ-περθ-σε), ἤμερσε (ἀμέρδω). But ν

* The form ἤρᾶ-το, which is usually taken to be an Aor. of ἀρ-νυ-μαι, may stand to ἀρέσθαι as ἔ-πᾶ-το to πτέσθαι, ὄνα-το to ὄνο-μαι, δίε-νται to δίε-σθαι (see however Cobet, *Misc. Crit.* p. 400).

before δ is lost in ξ -σπεισα (for ξ -σπενδ-σα): cp. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ for $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta$ -σσαι, &c. The form $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\alpha\iota$ (Il. 23. 337) is later.

The Verb-Stem $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda$ - makes an Aor. Opt. $\delta\phi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon$: see § 53.

40.] Primitive Aorists with Suffix -σ-. Originally the Sigmatic Aorist was inflected like the Aorist in - $\acute{\alpha}$ already described (§ 15): that is to say, the α appeared in the 1 Sing. (perhaps also 3 Plur. - $\acute{\alpha}\nu$) and the Stem was liable to variation between a strong and a weak form. Thus from a Stem $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\kappa$ -, $\tau\ddot{\upsilon}\kappa$ -, with the regular phonetic changes, we should have had—

Active, 1 Sing. $\xi\tau\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}$.

2 $\xi\tau\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}$ (for ξ - $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\kappa$ -σ- $\acute{\alpha}$).

3 $\xi\tau\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}$ (for ξ - $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\kappa$ -σ- τ).

1 Plur. $\xi\tau\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu$ (or $\xi\tau\upsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu$).

2 $\xi\tau\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon$ (or $\xi\tau\upsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon$).

3 $\xi\tau\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$.

Middle, 1 Sing. $\xi\tau\ddot{\upsilon}\gamma\mu\eta\nu$ (for ξ - $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ- $\mu\eta\nu$).

2 $\xi\tau\upsilon\acute{\alpha}$ (for ξ - $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ- $\sigma\acute{o}$), Imper. $\tau\ddot{\upsilon}\acute{\alpha}$.

3 $\xi\tau\upsilon\kappa\tau\acute{o}$ (for ξ - $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ- $\tau\acute{o}$).

3 Du. $\xi\tau\ddot{\upsilon}\chi\theta\eta\nu$ (for ξ - $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ-σ- $\theta\eta\nu$).

Inf. $\tau\ddot{\upsilon}\chi\theta\alpha\iota$ (for $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ-σ- $\theta\alpha\iota$ or $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ- $\theta\alpha\iota$).

Part. $\tau\ddot{\upsilon}\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ (for $\tau\upsilon\kappa$ -σ- $\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$).

Several forms belonging to this scheme have survived in Homer:

$\xi\lambda\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$, Mid. $\xi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\mu\eta\nu$, $\xi\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\acute{o}$, Imper. $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{o}$, Inf. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ - $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\alpha\iota$, Part. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ - $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$.

($\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ - $\mu\eta\nu$), $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\acute{o}$, Imper. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\xi}\acute{o}$, Inf. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\alpha\iota$.

$\xi\mu\iota\acute{\alpha}$, Mid. $\xi\mu\iota\kappa\tau\acute{o}$ and $\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\acute{o}$.

$\xi\pi\eta\acute{\alpha}$, Mid. $\kappa\alpha\tau$ - $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\kappa\tau\acute{o}$ (Il. 11. 378).

$\xi\pi\epsilon\rho\sigma\alpha$, Mid. Inf. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\theta\alpha\iota$.

$\xi\pi\eta\lambda\alpha$, Mid. $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ - $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\lambda\tau\acute{o}$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\acute{o}$.

($\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha$ - $\tau\acute{o}$), $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\sigma\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\acute{o}$ (better $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\sigma\acute{o}$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\acute{o}$), Part. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi$ - $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$.

$\acute{\omega}\rho\sigma\alpha$, Mid. $\acute{\omega}\rho\tau\acute{o}$, Imper. $\acute{\omicron}\rho\sigma\acute{o}$, Inf. $\acute{\omicron}\rho\theta\alpha\iota$, Part. $\acute{\omicron}\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$.

$\acute{\eta}\rho\sigma\alpha$, Part. $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$.

($\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha$ - $\tau\acute{o}$), Part. $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$.

($\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}$ - $\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$), $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\kappa\tau\acute{o}$ (read $\text{Fe}\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\text{Fe}\lambda\iota\kappa\tau\acute{o}$, § 53).

$\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\acute{o}$ seized ($\gamma\epsilon\mu$ -).

$\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\theta\eta\nu$, 3 Du. $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\theta\eta\nu$ (cp. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\nu\theta\epsilon$ for $\pi\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu$ -σ- $\theta\epsilon$).

$\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\acute{o}$ (Hes. Th. 481), Part. $\acute{\iota}\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ coming.

Add $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\kappa\tau\acute{o}$ (Thebais, fr. 3), $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\acute{o}$ (Alcm. fr. 141).

The 'regular' forms, such as $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\xi}\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{o}$, $\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\tau\acute{o}$, $\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\tau\acute{o}$, are to be explained like $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha$ - $\tau\acute{o}$, &c. (§ 15). On this view $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\xi}\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{o}$ and $\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\tau\acute{o}$ are related to $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\acute{o}$ and $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\acute{o}$ precisely as $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha\tau\acute{o}$ to $\chi\ddot{\upsilon}\tau\acute{o}$, and similarly $\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha$ - $\tau\acute{o}$ to $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ as $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\alpha\tau\acute{o}$ to $\chi\ddot{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$.

The form $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\theta\eta\nu$ (Il. 4. 146) is now generally taken as 3 Plur., for $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\theta\epsilon\nu$, or $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$. The 3 Plur. in - $\eta\nu$ is found occa-

sionally on inscriptions in other dialects (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 468); but that is very slight ground for admitting it in Homer. In any case it is later than -εν, and due to the analogy of the other Person-Endings*.

The Homeric forms of the Subj. also pre-suppose a Stem without final α: e. g. the Subj. *βήσ-ο-μεν* points to an Indic. **έ-βησ-μεν* (§ 80). The existence of such Indicatives in an earlier period of the language is proved by the Sanscrit Aorists with *S*, many of which join the Person-Endings directly to the Stem, without an 'auxiliary' α (except in the 1 Sing. and 3 Plur.); e. g. the Root *ji* gives *ajaish-am*, 3 Sing. *ajais* (for *a-jai-s-t*), 1 Plur. *ajaish-ma*, &c.

Upon this stage of inflexion Joh. Schmidt has based a very probable explanation of the 3 Plur. Ending -σαν (*K. Z.* xxvii. p. 323). It is evident that owing to the loss of σ the Tense-Stem of such forms as *έτευγμεν*, *έτενκτε*, *έτυκτο* appears as *τευκ-* or *τυκ-*, instead of *τευξ-*, *τυξ-*. Consequently the form *έτευξαν* would be felt as *έτευκ-σαν*; that is to say, -σαν would become in fact the 3 Plur. Ending. Such an Ending would then be easily transferred to other Tenses,—*έδο-σαν*, *έστα-σαν*, &c. The usual theory is that -σαν in these forms comes from the regular Aor. in -σα. But this does not explain why it is confined to the 3 Plur.—why we have (e. g.) *έδο-σαν* but not *έδο-σαμεν*.

41.] Aorist in -σε(ο). Several Stems form a Weak Aorist as a thematic tense, with ε or ο instead of α: viz. *ίξο-ν*, *έ-βήσε-το*, *έ-δύσε-το* (*δυσό-μενος* Od. 1. 24); Imper. *πελάσσε-τον* (Il. 10. 442), *άξε-τε*, *οίσε-τε*, *λέξε-ο*, *ορσε-ο*; Inf. *άξέ-μεναι* (Il. 23. 50, 111), *οισέ-μεναι* (Il. 3. 120): perhaps also *έ-πεσο-ν* (*πετ-*).

The forms *έβήσετο*, *έδύσετο* were preferred by Aristarchus to those in -ούτο: see Schol. A on Il. 2. 579., 3. 262., 10. 513. They were regarded by ancient grammarians as Imperfects (Schol. A on Il. 1. 496); and this view is supported by one or two passages, esp. Od. 10. 107, where *ή μὲν ἄρ' ἐς κρήνην κατεβήσετο* must mean *she was going down to the spring* (when the messengers met her). So in the Part., Od. 1. 24 *οἱ μὲν δυσομένον Ὑπερίονος οἱ δ' ἀνιόντος*, and Il. 5. 46 *νύξ' ἱππων ἐπιβησόμενον* *pierced as he was mounting his chariot*, cp. 23. 379.

The forms *ίξο-ν*, *άξέ-μεναι*, &c. answer closely to the Sanscr. Preterite in -sa-m, as *á-diksha-m*. *έπεσον* is difficult to explain as *έ-πετ-σον*, both (1) because it can hardly be accidental that we never have *έπεσον*, and (2) because it has to be separated from the Doric *έπετον*. Possibly there was a primitive non-Thematic **έ-πετα*, *έ-πες*, *έπες* (for *έ-πετ-ς*, *έ-πετ-τ*), Du. *έπεστον*, &c., 3 Plur. *έ-πετ-αν*, from which both *έπετ-ον* and *έπεσ-ον* might be derived in much the same way as *έκταν-ον* from the primitive *έ-κτενα*, Plur. *έ-κτᾶ-μεν* (§ 13).

* One of the reviewers of the former edition (Cauer in the *Jahresb. d. philol. Vereins*) objects that the Dual does not suit the context ('hier gar nicht in den Zusammenhang passt'). The subject is *μηροί*, which is Dual in sense; and the Dual might well be restored throughout the sentence (*τοῖω τοι, Μενέλαε, μάνθην αἵματι μῆρῶ εὐφύε, κνήμαί τε κ.τ.λ.*). The explanation of *μάνθην* as a Dual is due to Buttmann (*Ausf. Spr.* ii. 244, ed. 2).

42.] The Aorist in -η-ν. The Stem of this Tense is formed by suffixing η to the weak form of the Verb-Stem. This η becomes ε in the 3 Plur. (-εν for original -εντ), the Opt. and the Part. (i.e. before ι and ντ). The Person-Endings are those of the Active, but the meaning is either Intransitive or Passive: e.g. ἐ-χάρ-η *rejoiced*, ἐ-δάη *was taught*, ἐ-φάν-η *appeared*, τράφ-η *was nurtured*, ἐ-άλ-η *shrank* (Stem Fελ-), δι-έ-τμαγ-ε-ν *parted asunder*, ἐ-πάγ-η, ἐ-δάμ-η, ἐ-άγ-η, ἐ-βλαβ-εν, ἐ-μίγ-η, τάρπ-η-μεν and (with Metathesis) τραπ-ή-ομεν (τέρπ-ω), &c.

The Stem is long in ἐ-πλήγ-η (cp. ἐ-πέπληγ-ον, πληγ-ή), and once in ἐάγῃ (ā in Il. 11. 559)*. The Inf. τεροσή-μεναι (τεροσηῖναι), which occurs in Il. 16. 519, Od. 6. 98, need not be an Aorist: see the similar forms in § 19. The Part. ἀνα-βροχέν (Od. 11. 586) is not connected with ἀνα-βέβροχεν (§ 25); see Buttmann, *Lexil.*

There is evidently a close relation between these 'Passive' Aorists and the forms discussed in § 14 (such as ἐ-βλη-ν, ἐ-πτη-ν, ἐ-τλη, ἐ-σβη), and we can hardly doubt that they are nothing more than an extension by analogy of that older type (see Brugmann, *M. U.* i. 71). The chief difference is that (as in the Thematic Aorist) the Stem is usually disyllabic, retaining the short vowel of the root: thus we have ἐ-δάμη, but δμη- in δέ-δμη-ται, &c.

The Aorists with Stems in ā and ω (§ 19) are parallel to the Aorists in -η. Thus γηρᾶ-ναι, βιω-ναι, ἄλω-ναι only differ in the quality of the vowel from σαῖ-ναι, ἄλῃ-ναι: and there might have been numerous Aorists in -ᾶν and -ων along with those in -ην, just as there are derivative Verbs in -αω, -οω as well as in -εω.

43.] The Aorist in -θη-ν. The Stem of this Tense is formed by the Suffix -θη. The Person-Endings are the same as those of the Aorist in -η, and the meaning is Reflexive or Passive.

In later Greek the Verb-Stem is mostly in the strong form, as ἐ-δήχ-θη-ν, ἐ-λείφ-θην, ἐ-ζεύχ-θην; but this does not seem to have been the original rule: e.g. Homer has ἐ-τύχ-θη *was made*, Attic ἐ-τεύχ-θη. So we find the weak Stem in κατ-έ-κτᾶ-θεν (κτεν-), τᾶ-θη (τεν-), τάρφ-θη (τέρπ-ω), τραφ-θῇ-ναι (τρέπω), ἐ-στᾶ-θη (Od. 17. 463), λῦ-θη, ἐξ-ε-σύ-θη, ἐ-φθί-θεν.

The Stems of κλίνω and κρίνω vary in regard to the ν: we have ἐ-κλίν-θη and ἐ-κλῖ-θη, κριν-θέ-ντες and δι-έ-κρί-θε-ν.

44.] Meaning of the Passive Aorists. The Aorist in -η appears to have originally had an Intransitive sense, of which the Passive sense was a growth or adaptation. This transition is

* In the former edition Bekker's reading ἐάγῃ (Pf. Subj.) was given as the probable correction for this passage. But the sense required is rather that of the Aor.—*were* (i.e. *had been*) *broken*—than the Pf.—*are in a broken state*. Cp. Hes. Op. 534 οὐ τ' ἐπὶ νῶτα ἔαγε *whose back is broken down*, i.e. *bowed*. As to the ā of ἐάγῃ see § 67, 3.

seen (e.g.) in ἐχάρη *rejoiced*, ἐδάη *learned*, ῥύη *flowed*, ἐφάνη *appeared*. In these instances the Passive grows out of the Intransitive meaning (as in the Middle forms it grows out of the Reflexive meaning). Similar transitions of meaning may be found in the Perfect (§ 28, *fin.*), the Aorist (ἔσβη *was quenched*), and even in the Present, as ἐκπίπτειν *to be driven out*, κείται *is laid down* (as Pf. Mid. of τίθημι), and πάσχω itself.

The Aorist in -θη-ν is often indistinguishable in meaning from the Aor. Middle. There appears to be ground for distinguishing it from the Aor. in -ην as originally reflexive rather than intransitive (Wackernagel, *K. Z.* xxx. 305.) In many cases Middle forms are used in Homer interchangeably with those in -θη-ν: thus we find ἀάσατο and ἀάσθη, αἰδετο ἡδέσατο and αἰδέσθητε, ἀτξασθαι and ἀτχθῆναι, δυνήσατο and δυνάσθη, κορέσσατο and κορέσθη, μνήσασθαι and μνησθῆναι, ἀπενάσσατο and νάσθη, ἐφρασάμην and ἐφράσθη, ὀίσατο and ὠίσθη, ἐχολώσατο and ἐχολώθη, ἐρείσατο and ἐρείσθη, ὠρμήσατο and ὠρμήθη, &c.; also ἐφθιτο and ἐφθιεν, ἀμπνύτο and ἀμπνύνη, λύτο and λύθη, ἔκτατο and ἔκταθεν, λέκτο and ἐλέχθη, μίκτο and ἐμίχθη.

This observation has recently suggested a very probable account of the origin of the Aor. in -θη-ν. The 2 Sing. Mid. Ending in Sanscr. is -thās, to which would correspond Greek -θης. Hence the original inflexion was (e.g.) ἐ-λύ-μην, ἐ-λύ-θης, ἐ-λυ-το, &c. Then ἐλύθης was regarded as ἐ-λύθη-ς, that is to say, λυθη- was taken as the Tense-Stem, and the inflexion was completed on the model of the already formed Aorists in -ην (Wackernagel, *l. c.*).

The Aorists in -η-ν and -θη-ν are formations peculiar to Greek, and were doubtless developed along with the separation of Present and Aorist forms which had hardly been completed in the time of Homer (Curtius, *Verb.* ii. 1 ff.). It is worth notice that the three Aorists that have a distinctive Suffix agree in avoiding the Thematic Endings, while the Impf. tends to adopt them, as in ἐτίθει, ἐτίθει, ὤμνυε, &c. The reason doubtless was that the Thematic inflexion already prevailed in the Present. Thus a distinction of form was gained which was especially needed for the Aorists in -η-ν. Forms like ἐφίλει (which at first, as we see from φιλή-μεναι, subsisted side by side with ἐφίλη) were adopted as Imperfects, while ἐμίγη &c. were retained as Aorists.

Thematic Present (with Suffix).

45.] In the forms to which we now proceed the Verb-Stem receives a suffix which serves to distinguish the Present Stem; as τῦπ-τω, κάμ-νω, βά-σσω, κτείνω (for κτεν-ιω).

These suffixes may be compared with other elements used in the same way, but not always confined to the Present; as κ in ὀλέ-κω *I destroy*, ἐρύ-κω *I restrain*, διώ-κω *I chase*, γ in τμή-γω *I cut*, χ in νη-χέ-μεναι *to swim*, τρύ-χουσι *they waste*, σμή-χουν *to smear*, σ in αὔξω (*aug-eo*), θ in σχέ-θε *held*, ἔσθειν (*ἐδ-θειν*) *to eat*,

βρί-θο-ν were heavy, *πλή-θεν* was full, *ἔρε-θε* provoke, *φλεγέ-θει* blazes, *μινύ-θει* diminishes, *φθινύ-θει* wastes, *ἔργα-θεν* kept off, *θαλέ-θο-ντες* blooming, *μετ-ε-κία-θον* moved after, *ἡερέ-θο-νται* flutter, *ἡγερέ-θο-ντο* were assembled (*ἀγερ-*, in *ἀγείρω*), &c. These elements were called by Curtius Root-Determinatives (*Chron.* p. 22 ff.)—the name implying that they are of the nature of suffixes modifying or ‘determining’ the meaning of a simple Root. But their origin and primitive significance are quite unknown (Brugmann, *Grundriss*, ii. § 8, n. 2).

46.] The T-Class. The suffix *-τε* (ο) is usually found with a Verb-Stem ending in a labial mute (π, β, φ), as *ἐνιπ-τε* rebuke (*ἐνιπ-ή*), *χαλέπ-τει* annoys, *ἀστράπ-τει* lightens, *σκέπ-τεο* look out, *κλέπ-τε*, *κόπ-τε*, *τύπ-τε*, *ἔ-μαρπ-τε*; *ἄπτω* (ἄφ-) fasten, *κρύπτων* (κρύφ-α) hiding, *θάπτει* (θάφ-) bury, *ράπτειν* to sew, string together; *βλάπτει* (βλάβ-) harms.

The Stem is in the weak form; the corresponding long forms are generally wanting.

This suffix is combined with Reduplication in *ι-άπ-τω* (for *ι-ῖάπ-τω*, cp. Lat. *jac-io*) I hurl, which occurs in Od. 2. 376 *κατὰ χροῖα καλὸν ἰάπτῃ* shall maltreat (lit. knock about) her fair flesh*.

πτ may be for *π-τ*, and, if so, these Verbs would belong to the I-Class (§ 50). In some cases, however, the *π* represents an original guttural. Thus we find *ἐνίσσω* (*ἐνικ-ιω*), as well as *ἐνίπτω* (*ἐνιπ-ή*); *πέσσω*, later *πέπτω* (*πέπ-ων*); *νίջω*, later *νίπτω* (*ἀπονίπτεσθαι* in Od. 18. 179 is doubtful). Here *ἐνίσσω*, *πέσσω*, *νίջω* are formed by the suffix *-με*(ο), and consequently *ἐνίπτω*, *πέπτω*, *νίπτω* must be otherwise explained. So in *σκέπτομαι*, since *σκεπ-* is for *σπεκ-* (Lat. *spec-io*), the form with *πτ* must be at least later than the metathesis. Hence if we adhere to the supposition that *-πτ-* is for *-πτ-* we must explain these four forms as due to the analogy of other Verbs in *-πτε*(ο) already in existence.

47.] The Nasal Class. The suffix is *-νε* (ο) after a vowel or *μ*: *φθά-νει* comes first, *τί-νων* paying (a penalty), *δύ-νε* sank in, *θύ-νον* bustled, *κάμ-νε* grew weary, *τάμ-νε* cut; *-ἄνε*(ο) after a mute, *ἡμάρτ-ανε* missed, *ἡλθ-ανε* made fat, *ληθ-άνει* makes to forget, *οἰδ-άνει* swells, *κυδ-άνει* glorifies, *ἔ-κεύθ-ανον* hid, *ἀπ-εχθ-άνεαι* becomest hateful: often with the weak Stem and *ν* inserted, *ἀνδ-άνει* pleases (*ἄδ-*), *λανθ-ανόμην*, *ἔ-χανδ-ανον*, *ἔ-λάγχ-ανον*, *τύγχ-ανε*, *πυνθ-άνομαι*.

The suffix *-ανε*(ο) is combined with Reduplication (as in § 35)

* With *ι-άπ-τω* may be connected *ἔ-ἄφ-θη*, which occurs in the phrase *ἐνὶ δ' ἀσπίς ἑάφθη καὶ κόρυς* (Il. 13. 543., 14. 419), of a warrior's shield, which falls with or after him. For the aspirate (*ἑάφθη* for *ἑ-ἄφθη*) compare *ζηκα*, *ἔεστο*, &c. This explanation was given by Ebel, in *K. Z.* iv. 167. The scholar to whom I owe this reference, F. Froehde, derives it from Sanscr. *varāmi*, ‘I throw, strew about:’ so *ἀπτοεπής* = ‘one whose words are thrown about at random’ (Bezz. *Beitr.* iii. 24). See Curtius, *Verb.* ii. 364 (2 ed.).

in *πιμ-πλ-άνεται* (Il. 9. 679), *ισχάνω* (for **σι-σχ-άνω*), *ιζάνω* (for **σι-σδ-άνω*).

The class of Verbs in *-νω* is derived from the Non-thematic Verbs in *-νυ-*. Sometimes, as has been noticed (§ 18), *-νυ* takes the Thematic *ε* or *ο* after it, as in *δμ-νύω* for *δμνῦ-μι*; but in other cases, especially when *-νυ* follows a vowel, *υ* becomes *φ* and is lost. Thus *ἀ-νυ-* gives *ἀνύω* *I accomplish*, and also *ἀνεται* (*ᾱ*) *draws to a close*: so *τινυ-ται* *punishes* and *τίνω*, *φθίνυ-* (in *φθίνυ-θω*) and *φθίνω*. The vowel of *ᾱνω*, *φθᾱνω*, *τίνω*, *φθίνω* is long in Homer, short in Attic (cp. Homeric *ξέιν-ος* for *ξέν-φος*, Attic *ξέν-ος*); whereas in *κλίνω*, *κρίνω* (for *κλιν-ιω*, *κριν-ιω*) it is always long. Note also that *-νε(ο)* for *-νφε(ο)* is confined to the Present, while the *ν* of *κλίνω*, &c. appears in other Tenses (Solmsen, *K. Z.* xxix. 78).

ἐλαύνω has been explained as **ἐλα-νυ-ω*, but there is no parallel for epenthesis of *υ*.

The *ᾱ* of *ικάνω*, *κιχάνω* points to *-αν-φω*, but the forms have not been satisfactorily explained.

48.] Stems formed by *-σκε(ο)*, the Iterative class of Curtius.

(1) Without Reduplication, as *βά-σκε go*, *βό-σκει feeds*, *φά-σκε said*, *ἰλά-σκο-νται propitiate*, *ἡλάσκουσι flit about*, *θνή-σκο-ν died*, *θρή-σκουσι leap*, *προ-βλω-σκέ-μεν to go before* (*βλω-* for *μλω-*).

(2) With Reduplication, *μι-μνή-σκε-ται is reminded*, *κί-κλη-σκεν called*, *γι-γνώ-σκω I know*, *πί-φau-σκε showed*.

Stems ending in a consonant sometimes insert *ι*, as *ἀπ-αφ-ί-σκει deceives*, *ἄρ-ἄρ-ι-σκε fitted*, *εὕρ-ι-σκω I find* (Od. 19. 158), *ἐπ-αυρ-ίσκονται get benefit from* (Il. 13. 733). A final consonant is lost before *σκ* in *δι-δασκέ-μεν* (for *δι-δαχ-σκε-*), *ἴσκω* and *εἴσκω* (cp. *ἴκ-ελος*), *τι-τύσκε-το* (*τύκ-* or *τύχ-*), *δει-δίσκετο welcomed* (*δίκ-*); probably also in *μίσγο-ν* (for *μιγ-σκο-ν*) and *πάσχω* (for *παθ-σκω*).

49.] **Iterative Tenses.** The suffix *-σκε(ο)* is also used to form a number of Past Tenses with Iterative meaning, as *ἔσκε* (for *ἔσ-σκε*) *used to be*, *ἔχε-σκε used to hold*, *καλέ-εσκε*, *πελέ-σκε-ο* (Il. 22. 433), *νικά-σκο-μεν* (Od. 11. 512), *τρωπά-σκετο* (Il. 11. 568), *ρίπτα-σκε*, *οἴχνε-σκε*, *πωλέ-σκε-το*, *ῶθε-σκε*, &c.; and from Aorist Stems, as *στά-σκε*, *δό-σκο-ν*, *εἶπε-σκε*, *φάγε-σκε*, *ἐρητύ-σα-σκε*, *δα-σά-σκε-το*, *ῶσα-σκε*, &c. These formations differ from the Present Stems described above (1) in carrying distinctly the notion of *repeated action* and (2) in being confined to the Past Indicative. They are peculiar to the Ionic dialect, and the forms derived from Aorists in *-σα* are only found in Homer.

ἔφασκο-ν has sometimes a distinctly Iterative meaning in Homer, as Od. 8. 565 *Ναυσίθου, δς ἔφασκε Ποσειδάων' ἀγάσασθαι*, and the Pres. *φάσκω* does

not occur. It may be regarded as a link between the two groups of Stems with -σκ.

It is remarkable that in the Latin Verbs in -sco we may distinguish in the same way between the regular Inceptives, such as *lique-sco*, *puer-a-sco*, and the Presents, such as *pa-sco*, *pro-fic-iscor*, in which the Inceptive meaning is hardly, or not at all, perceptible. Originally, no doubt, there was a single group of derivative Stems in σκε(ο) with the meaning of continued or repeated action.

50.] The I-Class. The suffix was probably -ιε(ο) in a pre-historic period of Greek: it appears in Stems of the following forms:—

a. In -ιω, -αιω, -ειω, -υιω or -ῶω (for -ι-ιω, -α-ιω, &c.), the ι blending with the final vowel of the Stem.

b. With epenthesis of ι, in -αινω, -αιρω (for -αν-ιω, -αρ-ιω).

c. With assimilation, in -λλω (for -λ-ιω), -σσω (for -κ-ιω, -τ-ιω), and -ζω (for -δ-ιω, -γ-ιω).

d. By compensatory lengthening in -εινω, -ειρω, -ῖνω, -ῦνω, -ῠρω (for -εν-ιω, -ερ-ιω, -ῖν-ιω, -ῡν-ιω, -ῠρ-ιω). That the ει of -εινω, -ειρω is not a true diphthong (and therefore not due to epenthesis) is shown by the corresponding Doric -ηνω, -ηρω.

e. In -αω, -εω, -οω, -αυω, -ευω, -ουω (for -α-ιω, &c.).

a. Verbs in -ιω, &c.

51.] The Verbs in which the original ι becomes ι, thus forming -ιω, -αιω, -ειω, -υιω, are almost confined to the Homeric dialect. The chief examples are as follows:—

(1) -ιω: ἐσθλει *eats*, ἴδιον *I sweated*, μῆνιε *be angry*, μάστιγε *whip*, ἀνα-κήκιε *gushed forth*, κονίω-ντες *raising dust*. In these verbs (except perhaps the first two) the Verb-Stem ends in ι, so that (e.g.) κονίω-ντες is for κονι-ι-ο-ντες; so probably τιῶ *I honour*, φθίω *I waste away*, for τι-ιω, φθι-ιω. The ι therefore is naturally long, but may be shortened before a vowel; hence it is usually doubtful in quantity.

(2) -αω: usually with loss of σ or F, ναίουσι *dwelt* (Aor. νάσ-σα, νάσ-θη), μαίεσθαι *to feel one's way* (Fut. μάσ-σεται), λιλαίει *desirest* (λι-λασ-); καίω (for κᾰῖ-ιω, cp. Aor. ἔκηα for ἔ-κηῖ-α), κλαίω (for κλᾰῖ-ιω), δαίε *kindled* (δᾰν-), ναίον *swam* (cp. ναῦ-ς), γαίω *rejoicing* (γαῦ-ρος, Lat. gau-deo); κέραι *mix*, ἀγαιόμενος *indignant* (cp. ἐ-κέρασ-σα, ἡγάσ-σατο, but the σ in these words is not original, § 39, 2); perhaps also φθαίω (if παρα-φθαίησι in Il. 10. 346 is Pres. Subj., see K. Z. xxiii. 298).

δαίω *divide* forms its Tenses from two roots, (1) δαι-, 3 Plur. Pf. δεδαί-αται, cp. δαί-ννμι, δαί-ς, δαι-τός, and (2) δατ-, Pf. δέδασ-ται, Pres. δατ-έομαι (cp. πατ-έομαι, πεπάσμεν).

(3) -ειω : πενθείε-τον (probably for πενθεσ-ξε-τον) *mourn*, μαχείδ-μενος *fighting*, οἰνοβαρείων *drunken*, τέλειο-ν *brought to pass*, κείων *splitting*, ἀκειό-μενοι *being healed*, νεικείη-σι *shall quarrel*, ὀκνείω *I shrink*, ὕμνείω (Hes.).

When the diphthongs αι, ει come before a vowel there is a tendency to drop the ι; as ἀγα-ίο-μαι, 2 Plur. ἀγάα-σθε (for ἀγά-ε-σθε, § 55); κερα-ίω, 2 Plur. κεράα-σθε; τέλε-ιο-ν, also τέλε-ο-ν; ναῖον *swam*, also νά-ει, νά-ουσι; perhaps also δάηται *shall be destroyed* (root δαι-; see Schulze, *K. Z.* xxix. p. 258). Where this tendency does not show itself, as in παίω, πταίω, σείω, it will usually be found that the diphthong belongs to the whole Verb, not merely to the Present Stem.

So perhaps ἐράασθε *ye loved*, ἱλάονται *appease*, ἔλων *drove* (Part. ἐλάων), ἔκλων *broke*: unless these forms are obtained by simple change from the Non-Thematic ἐρα-μαι, &c. (§ 18).

For the Presents in -ειω from -εφω (θείω, πλείω, &c.), see § 29, 3.

(4) -υιω : ὄπνιε *had to wife* (for ὀπνυ-ιω).

Most of the Presents in -υω are of this Class (original -νιω), as φύω (Aeolic φυίω), θύω (ἔθνιεν Hesych.), λύω, δύω, ἰθύω, ἡπύω, δίζυω. The vowel is doubtful, but only because it comes before another vowel (as was noticed in the case of Verbs in -ιω).

ἰθύω generally has υ̇; but υ̇ in ἐπι-θύουσι (Il. 18. 175), which ought to be so divided, not ἐπι-θύουσι. It is a Denominative from ἰθύς (υ̇) *aim*.

The Verbs in -ευω, -ουω are probably also of the I-Class (for -εϋιω, -ουιω). For, as Curtius points out (*Verb.* i. 360), they are chiefly Denominatives, and it is contrary to analogy to form a Verb by suffixing the Thematic ε (ο) to a Noun-Stem.

b. Epenthesis of ι.

52.] It will suffice to give a few examples:—

-νω : μαίνο-μαι, φαίνω, βαίνω (βαμ-ιω), and with reduplication, τι-ταίνω, παμφαίνω.

-ρω : αἶρω, σκαίρω, ἀσπαίρω, μαρμαίρω, καρκαίρω, χαίρω.

αἶρω (for ἀρ-ιω) is distinct from αἶρω, which by contraction would become ᾄρω: cp. αἶδω, ᾄδω (Brugmann, *K. Z.* xxvii. 196).

This Class includes also the numerous Denominatives in -αινω, -αιρω: see § 120. The Stem is in the weak form.

c. Assimilation of ι.

53.] Examples: -λλω : ἄλλο-μαι, βάλλω, πάλλω, στέλλω, τέλλω; from Nouns, ἀγγέλλω, ναντίλλομαι; with Reduplication ἰάλλω, ἀτιτάλλω *I rear, tend*, cp. ἀτάλλω *I cherish*.

Epenthesis (instead of Assimilation) is found in ὀφέιλω *I owe*.

-σσω : ὄσσο-μαι (ὀκ-), πέσσω (πεκ-), ἐλίσσω (ἐλικ-), πτύσσω (πτύχ-), λίσσο-μαι (λίτ-), κορύσσω (κορυθ-), πτώσσω (πτωκ-).

-ζω: for -διω in κλύζω, φράζω, χάζο-μαι; for -γιω in ἄζο-μαι, ῥέζω, τρίζω; with reduplication, μιμνάζω *I loiter*, βιβάζω *I cause to go*, ἐλελίζω *I make to quiver* (II. 1. 530)*.

d. Compensatory lengthening.

54.] Examples: -εινω (for -εν-ιω), in τείνω, κτείνω, θείνω.

-ειρω (for -ερ-ιω), in εἶρω, κείρω, μείρομαι, πείρω, σπείρω, τείρω, φθειρω, ἀγείρω, ἀείρω, ἐγείρω, ἐθείρω.

-ῖνω (for -ιν-ιω), in κλίνω, κρίνω, ὀρίνω.

-ῡνω (for -υν-ιω), in πλύνω, ἐντύνω.

-ῠρω (for -υρ-ιω), in κύρω, μύρομαι, φύρω, ὀδύρομαι.

e. Verbs in -αω, -εω, -οω.

55.] **Assimilation.** This term is applied to certain forms of the Verbs in -αω, in which, instead of contraction, we find *assimilation* of one of two concurrent vowels to the other, as ὀρώω for ὀράω, ὀράαs for ὀράεις.

The chief varieties are as follows:—

(a) Forms with simple Assimilation, the vowel being long—

μνᾶό-μενοι	gives	μνωό-μενοι
ῆβάο-ντες	„	ῆβώο-ντες
μενοινάω	„	μενοινώω
ῆγά-εσθε	„	ῆγάασθε
μνά-εσθε	„	μνάασθε
μνάη	„	μνάα (2 Sing. Mid.).

(b) With shortening of the first vowel—

ὀράω	gives	ὀρόω
ἐάη-s	„	ἐάα-s
αἰτιάε-σθαι	„	αἰτιάα-σθαι.

Cp. δεδάα-σθαι from δεδαέ-σθαι (§ 35) and ἀγάα-σθε from ἀγάε-σθε; Fut. ἐλώω, κρεμόω from ἐλάω, κρεμάω.

(c) With lengthened second vowel—

ὀράο-ντες	gives	ὀρόω-ντες
ὀράοι-τε	„	ὀρόφ-τε
ὀράει-s	„	ὀράα-s.

This is the commonest form of Assimilation: cp. δηῖόω-ντο, δηῖόφ-εν from δηῖώω, ἀρόωσι (Od. 9. 108) from ἀρόω, κατ-ηπιόωντο (II. 5. 417), ἐστρατόωντο (II. 4. 378), ῥυπτόωντα (Od.).

* Cobet (*Misc. Crit.*), following Bentley, has sought to show that the forms of ἐλελίζω belong in reality to ἐλίσσω (*Feλίσσω*). He is doubtless right in substituting *Feλιχθέντες* for ἐλελιχθέντες *wheeling about*: but it seems necessary to retain ἐλελίζω where the meaning is *to set trembling* (with intensive reduplication, like ἀκαχίζω, ὀλολύζω, &c.).

(d) With lengthened second vowel (the first being also long), in very few forms—

δράνουσι	gives	δρώωσι
μαιμάουσι	„	μαιμώωσι
ῥβάουσα	„	ῥβώωσα
μενοινάει	„	μενοινάα.

Other isolated examples are: *μενοινῆσι* (Il. 15. 82); *ἀλόω* (Od. 5. 377), 2 Sing. Imper. of *ἀλάομαι* (for *ἀλάεο ἀλάου*); *κεκράανται*, *κρηῆναι*, *κραιαίνω*; *φαάνθη* (for *φαέν-θη*); *σώωσι* (Subj.), *σώψς*, *σώφ* (Opt., cp. § 83), *σώντες* (*σαόω*). Similar phenomena may be seen in *φώω* for *φάος* (or *φᾶος*), *σός* for *σᾶος*, *φαάντατος* for *φαέντατος*, *νηπιάς* for *νηπιέας*, *πρώονες* (Il.) for *πρήονες*, *ἄστυβοώτης* for *ἄστυβοήτης*: also in a form *Αινείω* (for *Αινείαο*) read by Zenodotus in Il. 5. 263, 323.

1. These forms were regarded by the older grammarians as the result of a process called ‘distracted,’ (the exact reverse of contraction), by which a long vowel, *α* or *ω*, could be separated into two distinct vowels (*ᾱα*, *ωω*, &c.). The first attempt to account for them in a more rational way was made by L. Meyer (*K. Z.* x. 45 ff.). According to him they represent an intermediate stage in the process of contraction. The order, he argued, is *δράω*—*δρόω*—*δρᾶ*: i.e. in *δρόω* the *α* has been assimilated to the following *ω*, but is not yet uttered in one breath with it. In the forms *δρόωντες*, *δρόωσι*, &c. he pointed out that the long vowel is never wanted for the metre, and accordingly he wished to read *δρόοντες*, *δρόουσι*, &c. To this last proposal exception was taken by G. Curtius (*Erläuterungen*, p. 96), who made the counter-supposition that, as the *α* of these Verbs was originally long, the successive steps might be *δράοντες*, *δρώοντες* and (by metathesis of quantity) *δρόωντες*. The stage *-ωο-* is exemplified in *μνωόμενος*.

2. The main objection to this theory lies in the circumstance that the forms *δρόω*, *δράας* and the like are exclusively ‘Epic,’ that is to say, they are confined to Homer, Hesiod, and their direct imitators. If they had been created by any natural development of Greek sounds, we should expect to find them in other dialects. But neither in Ionic nor elsewhere is there any trace of their existence in living speech. It must be admitted, too, that neither Meyer nor Curtius has given a satisfactory account of the long vowel in *δρόωσι*, *δρώοντο*, *δρόωντες*, &c. A form *δρόοντες*, as Curtius pointed out, would give *δρῶντες*, not *δρῶντες*. And if there has been metathesis of quantity, why do we never find *δρόωμεν* for *δράομεν*, or *δράατε* for *δράετε*?

3. An entirely different theory was put forward by J. Wack-

ernagel (*Bezz. Beitr.* iv. 259). The true Homeric forms, in his view, are the original uncontracted $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$, $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, &c. and these have passed into the $\delta\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$, $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\alpha\varsigma$, &c. of our Homer by a process of textual corruption consisting of two stages: (1) contraction, according to the ordinary rules of Attic, into $\delta\rho\acute{\omega}$, $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, &c.—which would obviously give forms of different metrical value from the original words,—and then (2) restoration of the metre by a kind of ‘distracted’ (in the old sense of the term), *i.e.* the insertion of a short vowel before the new contracted $-\acute{\omega}$, $-\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, &c. Thus $\omicron\nu\chi$ $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ first became $\omicron\nu\chi$ $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, and then *metri gratia* $\omicron\nu\chi$ $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\alpha\varsigma$ *.

4. Paradoxical as this may seem, there can be little doubt that it is substantially right. The forms in question, as Wackernagel justly argues, are not a genuine growth of language. They are the result of literary tradition, that is to say, of the modernising process which the language of Homer must have undergone in the long period which elapsed before the poems were cared for by scholars. The nature of this process is excellently described and illustrated in his dissertation. In many cases, too, he shows that when the later form of a word ceased to fit the metre, some further change was made by which the metrical defect was cured, or at least disguised. Corruption of this latter kind may often be traced in the various readings of MSS.

But must we suppose that $\delta\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$, &c. went through the two changes which Wackernagel postulates?

5. The case is unique, not only from the large number of forms involved, and the singularly thorough and systematic way in which they have been introduced into the text, but also from the circumstance which he has himself so well pointed out, *viz.* their unreal conventional stamp. They are hardly more ‘modern’—in the sense of being familiar through contemporary speech—than the forms which they have displaced. Wackernagel has shown how $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ and $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ supplanted the original $\acute{\eta}\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and $\tau\acute{\eta}\iota\omicron\varsigma$, even where the result was absolute ruin to the verse; as in *Od.* 19. 367, where nearly all the MSS. have $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ $\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\iota\omicron$. Similarly the loss of the old Gen. in $-\omicron\omicron$ (§ 98) has produced the forms Αἰόλου , Ἰφίτου , Ἰλίου , &c. scanned — — —. These examples, however, prove too much; for if such unmetrical forms could remain in the text without further change, why do we never find the slightest trace of an unmetrical $\delta\rho\acute{\omega}$?

6. It is a further objection to this part of Wackernagel’s theory that in several words the original $-\alpha\omega$, $-\alpha\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $-\alpha\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$, &c.

* This theory was criticised by Curtius in the *Leipziger Studien*, iii. pp. 192 ff.

have been retained. The instances are, *ναιετάω*, *-άει* (Hes. Th. 775), *-άουσι*, *-άων*, *-άοντα*, *ἔλάει*, *-άουσι*, *ἀοιδιάει*, *-άουσα*, *δομοστιάει*, *γοάοιμεν*, *-άοιεν*, *κραδάων*, *ἐλάων*, *ιλάονται*, *τηλεθάοντας*; with *ᾱ*, *ἀναμαιμάει*, *πεινάων*, *-άοντα*, *διψάων*. (The forms which have lost a *F*, as *λάε*, *φάε*, *ἔχραον*, do not concern us now.) A third variety is exhibited by the form *ναιετάωσαν* (*-σης*, *-ση*, *-σας*), which occurs in MSS., usually as a variant along with *-άουσαν* and *-άωσαν*. These facts are enough to show that the causes which produced the Homeric *-ω*, *-ας*, &c. were not of universal efficacy.

7. Is there, then, any way from *δράω*, *δράεις* to *δρόω*, *δράς* except through the contracted *δρῶ*, *δράς*? We have to deal with a time when *δρῶ*, *δράς* were the forms of ordinary speech, while *δράω*, *δράεις* were only known from the recitation of epic poetry. Under such conditions it is surely possible that the poetical forms were *partially assimilated* to the colloquial forms—that *δράω*, *δράεις* were changed into *δρόω*, *δράς* *by the influence of the familiar* *δρῶ*, *δράς*. Similarly *ἐνυδανε* for *ἐάνδανε* was doubtless due to the presence of the later *ἦνδανε*, not to any process of contraction and distraction. The principle is constantly exemplified in language; cp. the change of *φρασί*, the original Dat. Plur. of *φρήν*, into *φρεσί* through the association of the other Case-forms.

8. With this modification of Wackernagel's view it is easier to account for the occasional retention of the original *-αω*, *-αεις*, &c. If *δρόω*, *δράς* are due to the presence of *δρῶ*, *δράς* in everyday language, we may expect to find a different treatment of words which went out of use in post-Homeric times. Thus *ναιετάω* does not pass into *ναιετώω* because there was no *ναιετώ* alongside of it in common use. Similarly *ἐλώω*, *ἐλάαν* are accounted for by the Attic *ἐλῶ*, *ἐλᾶν*; but the Homeric Pres. Part. *ἐλάων* is unaffected. Two instances call for a different explanation, viz. *πεινάω* and *διψάω*, since they are not rare or poetical words. But these are exceptions which prove the rule. As is shown by the Attic contraction (*πεινής*, &c.), they are not really Verbs in *-αω*. Whatever may be the origin of the *ᾱ* in the Homeric *πεινάων*, *διψάων*, &c., they do not belong to the group with which we are now concerned.

9. An example of the process supposed by Wackernagel may be found in the Homeric *τρῶπάω*, *τρῶχάω*, *στρωφάω*, *πωτάομαι* (as to which see Nauck, *MéL. gr.-rom.* iv. 886). The forms which occur are always contracted, but in every instance except one (Il. 13. 557 *στρωφᾶτ'*) the uncontracted form can be restored *if at the same time the root-vowel is shortened*. Thus in Il. 15. 666 *μηδὲ τρωπᾶσθε φόβονδε* we may read *μηδὲ τροπάεσθε φόβονδε*. The verb *πωτάομαι* only occurs once (Il. 12.

287 λίθοι πωτῶντο θαμειαί), while the form ποτόμαι is well attested. In the other cases the restoration is supported by etymology (τροπάω from τροπή, &c.), and by the considerable traces of τροπάω, τροχάω, στροφάω in our manuscripts (see Leaf on II. 15. 666). The process must have been that (*e.g.*) original τροπάεσθε became τροπᾶσθε (which is also found in MSS.), and then τρωπᾶσθε.

10. In the Impf. Act. assimilation is unknown, mainly because the metre generally allows contraction. We find however (1) several uncontracted forms, viz. οὔται (Od. 22. 356), πέραον (II. 16. 367), ὕλαον (Od. 16. 5), κατεσκίαον (Od. 12. 436): ἐχράετε, ἐχραον (for ἐχράφετε ἐχραφον) do not belong to this head. Also (2) some verbs show the New Ionic -εο- for -αο-, viz. ὁμόκλεον, ὁμοκλέομεν, ποτέονται, μενολέον, ἤντεον, τρόπεον.

For φάος we find the two forms φῶος and φῶως (II. 16. 188 ἐξάγαγεν φῶωσδε), but never φόος or φῶος*. The exclusion of φῶος is remarkable, since it is related to φᾶος as μνώμενος to μνᾶόμενος. The reason doubtless is that φᾶος came under the influence of φῶς (cp. δράς and δρ-ᾱς). On the other hand σᾶος became σόος owing to the later ὥος. The change of πρήνοες to πρόνοες is similarly due to πῶνες. In the case of ἀστυβοώτης (for -βοήτης) there is no evidence of a form -βῶτης, but such a form would be according to the rules of Ionic contraction (βῶσας for βοήσας, &c.).

56.] Contraction. The extent to which contracted forms of verbs were admitted in the original text of Homer is a matter of much dispute. In this place we are properly concerned only with verbs of the I-Class (-αω, -εω, -οω, for -α-ιω, -ε-ιω, -ο-ιω), not with those in which a different spirant has been lost (as τρέω for τρέσ-ω, πλέω for πλέφ-ω).

1. In the verbs in -αω contraction is frequent. If the resolved form were written wherever the metre admits it, we should still find that in about half the whole number of cases the contraction must remain. It is worth notice too that contracted forms are often used in phrases of a fixed type, as ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (or προσηύδων)—τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώμαι—ὄρᾱ (ὄρᾱν) φάος ἡελίοιο—ἀνείρειαι ἥδ' ἐμεταλλᾶς—ἐξαύδα, μὴ κεύθε, and the like†. It has indeed been noticed that there is an apparent preference for the resolved -αον of the 1 Sing. and 3 Plur. Impf.‡; but this must be accidental. We must conclude then that contracted and uncontracted forms of verbs in -αω were used in the language of Homeric times with equal freedom: or at least—if this be thought improbable—that they subsisted together as alternative forms in the poetical dialect.

* φῶος may represent an ancient Plur. φάως (Joh. Schmidt, *Pluralb.* p. 142).

† Mangold, *Curt. Stud.* vi. 194.

‡ Menrad, pp. 122-124.

2. Verbs in *-εω* rarely contract *-εο* or *-εω*, except in the Participle (*-ευμενος* for *-εομενος*). This rule is confirmed from New Ionic inscriptions (Erman, *Curt. Stud.* v. 292), as well as the MSS. of Herodotus. For *ευ* in *ποιεύμην* (Il. 9. 495), *θηεύντο* (Il. 7. 444), *ὀχλεῦνται* (Il. 21. 261), *ἐγεγώνευν* (Od. 9. 47, &c.) and a few similar forms we should write *-εο* (see § 57).

The contraction of *-εε*, *-εει* is established by the large number of instances* in which it is required by the metre. Moreover it is not merely a *license*, necessary for the sake of admitting certain forms into the hexameter (such as *ταρβείς*, *νικεῖν*, *τελείται*, *ἡγείσθαι*, *σφαραγεί*, *ἐφίλει*, *οἰνοχόει*). Among the instances of contraction in the last foot we find 29 of *-ει* for *-εε* (as *χόλος δέ μιν ἄγριος ἦρει*), and 16 of *-εῖ* for *-έει* (as *καί με γλυκὺς ἱμερος αἶρει*); also the forms *φιλεῖ* (Il. 2. 197 *τιμὴ δ' ἐκ Διὸς ἔστι*, *φιλεῖ δέ ἐ μητίετα Ζεύς*, also Il. 7. 280., 10. 245, 552., 16. 94, Od. 15. 74), *δοκεῖ* (Od. 2. 33, and six times in the phrase *ὥς μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι ἄριστα*), *τελεῖ* (Il. 4. 161), *καλεῖ* (Il. 3. 390, Od. 17. 382), *φοβεῖ* (Il. 17. 177). On the other hand the uncontracted form has the support of the metre in about a hundred places, and against the instances now quoted of *φιλεῖ*, &c. we have to set about thirty of the corresponding uncontracted *φιλέει*, *δοκέεις*, *-ει*, *τελέει*, *καλέει*, *φοβέειν*. The uncontracted form therefore seems to have a slight preference, when the metre allows either.

In the MSS. of Homer contraction is generally introduced as far as possible, according to the tendencies of Attic: but the open forms occasionally survive, chiefly in the fourth foot (in such forms as *προσεφώνεε θεῖος ὄνειρος—καὶ ἦτε σῆμα ἰδέσθαι—κατὰ δ' ἦρε Πηλείωνα*). And the metre clearly points to the open form in several other places: as—

Il. 11. 553 (= 17. 663) *τάς τε τρέει ἐσσόμενός περ*.

21. 362 *ὥς δὲ λέβης ζέει ἔνδον κτλ.*

16. 201 *ἀπειλέετε Τρώεσσιν*.

Od. 10. 548 *ἀντέετε γλυκὺν ὕπνον*.

3. Verbs in *-οω* generally contract; *χολοῦμαι*, *κορυφοῦται*, *γονοῦμαι*. For the 'assimilated' forms *δηϊόωντο*, *κατηπιόωντο*, *ἐστρατόωντα*, *ῥυπώωντα* (§ 55) we ought, on the analogy of the Verbs in *-αω*, to substitute *δηϊόοντο*, &c.

57.] **Synzesis.** The vowel *ε* sometimes coalesces with a following *ο* or *ω*, so as to form one syllable for the purpose of the metre; e. g. *ἀελπτέοντες*, *ἡλάστεον*, *ἡγνέον*, *ἐπόρθεον* (at the end of a verse), *οἰκέοιτο*, *εἰλέωσι*, *χρεώμενος*. Whether the pronunciation of these words differed from that of the contracted forms is a question which perhaps there are no means of determining.

* About 160 according to the list in Menrad, pp. 132-142.

Meaning of Verbs of the I-Class.

58.] Verbs in -εω are mainly Intransitive, whether formed from Adjectives, as ἀπιστέω *I am unbelieving*, or abstract Nouns, as μοχθέω *I labour*. But there is also a group of Causatives in -εω, as φοβέω *I put to flight*, ὀχέω, φορέω.

Verbs in -οω are chiefly formed from Adjectives in -ος, and are Causative, as χηρόω *I make desolate*. Exceptions are, ὑπνώ-οντες *sleeping*, ριγώω *I shudder*, βιώω *I live*.

59.] **Desideratives.** One instance in -σειω is found in Homer, ὀψείοντες (Il. 14. 37) *going to see*. A suffix -ι(ο) may be found in κακκελοντες *going to bed* (κατά-κει-μαι), πι-όμενα *going to drink*, δρᾶνεις (Il. 10. 96) *thou art for doing*.

60.] **Frequentatives**, expressing *habitual action*, in -ταω, -ταζω, -τεω : as εὐχετάο-μαι, ναιετάω, οἰνοπο-τάζω, ζη-τέω (δί-ζη-μαι), λαμπετόωντι, ἔλκυστάζων.

In -ιαω, κελεντιδών *shouting* (as if from an abstract Noun κελεντία), κυδιών *glorying*.

In -ναω, as ἔρυκανώωσι *keep restraining*, ἰσχανώωσι.

In -θαω, as τηλεθώωσα *blooming* (θαλ-έθω).

61.] **Intensives**, expressing actions *intensified by repetition*. These are generally reduplicated Verbs of the I-Class, the reduplication containing either a diphthong or a second consonant, as δει-δίσσεσθαι *to terrify*, δαι-δάλλων *working curiously*, ἐκ-παι-φάσσειν *to rush in front*, παμ-φαίνων *gleaming*, βαμ-βαίνων *staggering*, μαρμαίροντες *glittering*, κάρ-καίρει *chattered*, πόρ-φυρε *was troubled* (lit. of water), πα-φλάζοντα *splashing*, πα-πταίνων *peeping round*, μαι-μάει *rages*, δενδίλλων (for δελδ-?) *winking*.

62.] **Collateral forms of the Present.** It is characteristic of the Homeric language that Present Stems formed in different ways from the same Verb-Stem often subsist together in actual use, as alternative forms expressing the same (or nearly the same) meaning. Thus we have λήθ-ω, ληθ-άνω, λανθάνω ; πεύθομαι, πυνθάνομαι ; βά-σκω, βαίνω, βιβά-ς, βιβά-ζω, βιβάσθων ; ἴκω, ἱκάνω, ἱκ-νέ-ομαι ; ἔχω, ἰσχω, ἰσχάνω, ἰσχανάω ; ἔρύ-κομαι, ἔρυκ-άνω, ἔρυκ-ανό-ωσι ; ἀλεύ-ομαι, ἀλύσχω, ἀλυσκάνω, ἀλυσκάζω ; τά-νυμαι, τα-νύω, τείνω, τιταίνω ; τεύχω, τυγχάνω, τι-τύ-σκομαι ; μένω, μί-μνω, μι-μνά-ζω.

It may be conjectured that these different forms originally expressed corresponding shades of meaning. In some cases a more specific meaning may still be traced ; e.g. φάσκω *I allege* (i.e. *keep saying*, or perhaps *try to say*) has something of the Iterative force (cp. ῥίπτασκε *he kept flinging about*) which in

θνήσκω, διδάσκω, &c. has been softened or generalised into the ordinary meaning of the Present. Similarly the reduplication in βίβας *striding*, μμινάζω *I stay waiting*, τιταίνω *I stretch* is to be compared with that of the Intensive Verbs. The Perfect, too, may be regarded as a refined and generalised kind of Intensive; cp. the forms λέληκα, κέκρᾱγα, μέμῡκα, &c. with καρκαίρω, ὀλολύζω, παφλάζω, &c.

Future in -σω.

63.] The Stem of the Future is formed by suffixing -σε(ο) to the Verb-Stem (in the strong form); as φή-σει, δώ-σω, δείξω (δεικ-), ἐκ-πέρω (περθ-), πείσομαι (πενθ-), χείσεται (χειδ-), δέξομαι (δεχ-), εἰ-σομαι (εἰ-μι).

The Stem ἐσ- gives ἔσ-σομαι and ἔσομαι (3 Sing. ἔσε-ται and ἔσ-ται); so ἔσ-σω (Fes-). The Futures φράσσο-μαι (or φράσο-μαι), μάσσε-ται, ἀπο-δάσσο-μαι (δάσο-νται), χάσσο-νται are formed like the corresponding Aorists in -σα; see § 39.

Other Verbs which have an Aorist in -σαῖ (-σᾶ)—the Verb-stem ending in a *short vowel* (§ 39, 2)—usually form the Future without σ. Thus we find:—

Aor. τελέσσαι	Fut. τελέ-ω.
καλέσσαι	καλέ-ουσα (Il. 3. 383).
ὀλέσσαι	ὀλείται, ὀλέ-εσθε (also ὀλέσσεις, ὀλέσσει).
μαχέσασθαι	μαχέ-ονται, μαχεῖται.
κορέσασθαι	κορέ-εις.
κρεμάσαντες	κρεμόω (for κρεμά-ω).
ἐπέρασσε	περάαν (for περά-ειν).
ἐδάμασσα	δαμόω, δαμᾶ (for δαμά-ω, δαμά-ει).
ἤλασσα	ἐλόω, Inf. ἔλααν (for ἐλά-ω, ἐλά-ειν).
ᾤμοσα	ὀμοῦμαι (for ὀμό-ομαι: 3 Sing. ὀμείται, on the analogy of ὀλείται, μαχεῖται).
ἐτάνυσσε	τανύω.
ἀνύσας	ἀνύω.
ἔρυσσα	ἐρύω, ἐρύ-εσθαι.
ἐρρύσατο	ρύεσθαι (Il. 20. 195).
ἀντιάσας	ἀντιόω (also ἀντιάσεις, Od. 22. 28).
ἐκόμισσα	κομιῶ.
αἰκίσσασθαι	αἰικιῶ.
κτερίσαιεν	κτεριόσσι.
	ἀγλαΐεσθαι.

It is not easy to determine (even approximately) the number of Future Stems formed like the Aorist in -σαῖ. In several instances the reading is uncertain: e. g. between ἐρύσσεσθαι and ἐρύσσασθαι (Il. 21. 176, Od. 21. 125), ἀγάσσεσθαι and ἀγάσσασθαι (Od. 4. 181), ἀνύσσεσθαι and ἀνύσασθαι (Od. 16. 373), παρελάσσεις, παρελάσσαις and παρελάσσαι (Il. 23. 427), ἀπουρίσσουνσι and ἀπουρήσουσι (Il. 22. 489). Several forms may be either

Fut. or Aor. Subj.: γυνάσσομαι (Il. 1. 427), δπάσσομεν (Il. 24. 153), εύνάσω (Od. 4. 408), ληίσσομαι (Od. 23. 357), ἐρύσσεται (Il. 10. 44), ὀλέσω (Od. 13. 399), ἀρεσσόμεθα. There remain: ἀρκέσει (Il. 21. 131—in Od. 16. 261 we should read ἀρκέση), αἰδέσεται (Il. 22. 124., 24. 208), ὀνόσσεται (Il. 9. 55), γανύσσεται (Il. 14. 504), ὀλέσσεις (Il. 12. 250), ὀλέσσει (Od. 2. 49), and a few forms of derivative Verbs in -άζω, -ίζω, viz. αἰχμάσσουσι (Il. 4. 324), θανμάσσεται (Il. 18. 467), ἐφοπλίσσουσι (Od. 6. 69), ἀντιάσεις (Od. 22. 28). On the whole it would appear that the Futures with σσ (or σ representing original σσ) are confined to the stems which ended in σ or a dental. In a very few instances they are due to analogy, like the corresponding Aorists in -σαῖ. Distinct Stems are used in ἀρπάζω, Aor. ἤρπασεν and ἀρπάζει, Fut. ἀρπάξω; ἀφύσσω, Aor. ἀφύσσάμενος, Fut. ἀφύξειν.

From μάχο-μαι, besides Aor. μαχέσασθαι, Fut. μαχέ-ονται, the MSS. give an Aor. μαχέσατο, Fut. μαχήσομαι. The ancient critics were divided as to these forms: Aristarchus wrote μαχέσατο, μαχήσομαι, others μαχέσσατο, μαχέσσομαι. The form μαχέσσα-το is supported by μαχέσασθαι; on the other hand μαχήσομαι is supported by μάχητής, μάχημον, &c. Considering the number of cases in which the language has avoided forming the First Aorist and the Future in the same way, the probability would seem to be that the MSS. are right.

For γυναικά γαμέσσεται αὐτός, which the MSS. give in Il. 9. 394, Aristarchus read γυναικά γε μάσσεται αὐτός: doubtless rightly, the trochaic caesura in the fourth foot being unknown in Homer (§ 367, 2: Veitch, p. 130). The usual Fut. is γαμέω.

Verb-Stems ending in a *liquid* (ρ, λ, μ, ν) insert ε and drop the σ, as μεν-έ-ω, ἀγγελ-έ-ων, κερ-έ-ειν, κραν-έ-εσθαι, ὀτρύν-έ-ω, κτεν-έ-ω*, and (with contraction) ἐκ-φανεί (Il. 19. 104), κατα-κτενεί (Il. 23. 412). But some Stems in ρ form -ρσω, as δια-φθέρ-σει, ὄρ-σουσα (Il. 21. 335), θερ-σόμενος (Od. 19. 507).

Similarly μάχομαι forms μαχέ-ονται (Il. 2. 366), and with contraction μαχείται (Il. 20. 26).

The derivative Verbs in -αω, -εω, -οω, -νω form -ησω, -ωσω, -ῶσω, the vowel being invariably long.

Exceptional: διδώ-σομεν (Od. 13. 358), διδώσειν (Od. 24. 314).

On the anomalous Futures ἐδομαι, πίομαι, δῆω, κείω, βείομαι, see §§ 59, 80.

64.] The Future in -σεω. The Suffix -σεε(ο) is found in ἐσ-σεῖται (Il. 2. 393., 13. 317, Od. 19. 302), and πεσέονται (Il. 11. 824) which is perhaps for *πετ-σεο-νται (but see § 41). Also,

* The forms κατα-κτανέουσι (Il. 6. 409) and κατακτανέσθε (Il. 14. 481) are probably corrupt (Cobet, *V. L.* p. 195). κτανέοντα (Il. 18. 309) involves a use of the Fut. Part. which is hardly to be defended: see § 86.

the accent of the Futures κομι-ῶ, ἀεικι-ῶ, κτερι-ούσι, ἀγλαϊ-εῖσθαι points to contamination of the forms in -σω and in -εω.

According to some ancient grammarians the Fut. of ἀνῶ, ἐρνῶ, &c. should be written ἀνῶ, ἐρνῶ, &c.; see Schol. Il. 11. 454., 20. 452. This form in -σῶ is found in Attic (πλευσοῦμαι, &c.: see however Rutherford's *New Phrynichus*, pp. 91-95); it answers to the Doric Fut. in -σιω.

65.] Futures from Perfect and Aorist Stems. A Future Perfect meaning appears in μεμνή-σομαι *I shall remember*, κεκλη-σῇ *thou wilt bear the name*, εἰρή-σεται *will be said*, κεχολώ-σεται *he will be in wrath*, δεδέξομαι *I will await*, πεφή-σεται *will appear* (Il. 17. 155), πεφή-σσαι *thou wilt be slain*, τετεύξεται *will be made*, λελείψεται *will remain behind*, βεβρώσεται *will be devoured*. In these cases the Fut. answers to a Perfect in actual use.

For πεφήσσαι J. Wackernagel (*K. Z.* xxvii. 279) would read πεφέσει (for πε-φεν-σαι, related to πεφᾶ-ται as τετεύξεται to τέτυκται). But the stem πεφεν- does not occur in the inflexion of the Verb, and there is no analogy to suggest it. More probably πεφήσσαι is formed from πέφαται on the analogy of ἐφᾶ-το and φή-σω, δύνα-μαι and δυνή-σομαι, &c.

Active Futures of the kind occur in Il. 15. 98 οὐδέ τί φημι πᾶσιν ὁμῶς θυμὸν κεχαρη-σέμεν *I do not suppose I shall gladden the heart of all alike* (cp. Od. 23. 266 οὐ μὲν τοι θυμὸς κεχαρη-σεται *will not be gladdened*): Il. 22. 223 πεπιθή-σω *I will persuade*: Od. 21. 153, 170 κεκαδή-σει *will deprive*. These forms may be either connected with the Perfect (κεχαρη-ότα *rejoicing*), or with the Reduplicated Aorist (κεχάρο-ντο *were gladdened*, πεπιθέιν *to persuade*). The latter view is supported by two other Futures of the kind; κεκαδη-σόμεθα *we will give way*, answering to the Aor. κεκαδών, Mid. κεκάδο-ντο; and πεφιδή-σεται *will spare*, answering to πεφιδέ-σθαι *to spare*. It will be seen that the Active forms of this kind have a distinctly *causative* meaning, whereas (*e.g.*) χαιρήσω and πιθήσω are intransitive.

Futures from the Passive Aorists. Of this formation two examples at most can be found in Homer: μιγή-σε-σθαι (Il. 10. 365), and δαή-σε-αι (Od. 3. 187., 19. 325). It has been already noticed (§ 9) that there is nothing in the Greek Future answering to the distinction between the Aorist and the Imperfect, though *a priori* such a distinction is quite conceivable.

It is worth noticing that in the Doric dialect this group of Futures takes the Active endings: as φανήσω.

66.] The Fut. is sometimes found with Mid. Endings while the corresponding Pres. is Act. The examples in Homer are:—εἰμί, ἔσομαι; θέω, θεύσομαι; κλαίω, κλαύσομαι; φεύγω, φεύσομαι; αἰδῶ, αἰέσομαι; κατα-νέω, κατα-νεύσομαι; θαυμάζω, θαυμάσεται.

With these are usually reckoned the Verbs in which the Pres. is of a different formation, as *ῥοῦμαι* (*ῥο-ννμι*), *πετόνται* (*π(ί)τω*), *τέξεσθαι* (*τίκτω*), *φθήσονται* (*φθάνω*), *βήσομαι* (*βαίνω*), *καμείται* (*κάμνω*), *τεύξεσθαι* (*τυγχάνω*), *ἀμαρτήσεσθαι* (*ἀμαρτάνω*), *θανέεσθαι* (*θνήσκω*), *πίεσομαι* (*πάσχω*): also the Futures to which no Pres. corresponds, as *εἴσομαι* (*οἶδα*), *δεῖσομαι* (*δεῖδια*), *ᾔσομαι* (*ᾔπ-*).

It may help to explain these cases if we consider that the Fut. Act. is apt to have a *Transitive* sense, as in *στήσω*, *βήσω*, *φύσω*. Hence there was a tendency to have recourse to the Middle whenever a distinctly intransitive sense was wanted.

Historical Tenses—the Augment.

67.] The Augment takes two forms, the *Syllabic* and the *Temporal*.

The Syllabic Augment is the prefix *ε-*, and is used for Stems beginning with a consonant. The Temporal Augment is a simple lengthening of the initial vowel of a Stem, the vowels *ā* and *ε* becoming *η*; as *ἦγο-ν* (*ἄγο-*), *ἦλα-σα-ν* (*ἐλᾶ-*), *ἦκε-το* (*ἴκε-*), *ᾔρ-το* (*ᾔρ-*), *ἦλῆλα-το* (Pf. *ἐλήλα-ται*), *ἦνεον* (*αἰνέω*), *ᾔχετο* (*οἴχομαι*). So the Impf. *ἦα I went* (Sanscr. *āyam*), from the stem *ei* (*εἰ-μι*): as to the form *ἦια* see § 12.

Many seeming exceptions are due to the loss of the original initial consonants, *F*, *σ*, *κ*. The loss of one of these consonants may generally be presumed whenever we find the Syllabic instead of the Temporal Augment. Thus—

F has been lost in *ἐ-άγη* and *ἐ-αξε* (*ἄγννμι*), *ἐ-άλη* (*ἑλ-*), *ἐ-ειπε*, *ἐ-έσ-σα-το* (*ἔνννμι*), *εἶδον* (for *ἐ-ἰδο-ν*), *ἐ-ώθεο-ν*; so perhaps, with contraction of *εε* to *ει*, *εἴρυ-σα* (*ἑρυ-*), and *εἰλο-ν*.

For *εἶδον* there is an Æolic form *εὔιδον* (*ἐ-ἑιδον*, cp. *εὐαθε*), which should perhaps be restored in some at least of the numerous places where the present text of Homer has *εἶσιδε* (Nauck, *Mél. gr.-rom.* ii. 407).

σ in *ἐ-έσσα-το* (for *ἐ-έσσα-*, from *σεδ-*), and, with contraction, *εἶπε-το* (*σεπ-*), *εἶσα-ν* (*σεδ-*), *εἶχο-ν* (*σεχ-*), *εἶρπο-ν* (*σερπ-*). In these cases the *σ* passed into the rough breathing, which was then thrown back on the Augment: but *εἶχον* has the smooth breathing owing to the following *χ*. Also *εἶα* (*εἶω* for *σεῖω*).

ι (or *γ*) perhaps in *εἶηκα* (for *ἐ-ἰηκα*) and, with contraction, *εἶμεν* (*ἐ-ἰ-μεν*), and *παρ-εἶθη* (*-ε-εθη*). But see § 16.

Several Homeric forms have been supposed to point to a Syllabic Augment *ῥ-* (instead of *ε-*). One of these—*ῥῖα I went*—has been already explained (§ 12). As to the others we have to note as follows:

(1) *ῥεπεν* (Il. 10. 499) is not from *εἶρω* to join together (Lat. *sero*), but from *ἀεῖρω*: for, as Cobet has shown (*Misc. Crit.* p. 326), *ἀεῖρω* is a technical word in the sense required (cp. Il. 15. 680 *συναεῖρεται ἵππους*, also the words *ἐννῶρις*, for *ἐνν-αορ-ίς*, and *παρ-ῥοπος*).

(2) In several words (as usually written) the initial vowel of the Stem is lengthened after $\acute{\epsilon}$ - f -: $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$ (for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $f\alpha\eta\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$), $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\varphi\eta\nu\chi\delta\epsilon\iota$ ($F\eta\nu\chi\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$), $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ - $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\varphi\eta\gamma\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ - $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\varphi\eta\zeta\epsilon$ ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$ - $F\acute{o}\iota\gamma\omega$), also $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta$ ($F\acute{\alpha}\gamma$ - $\nu\eta\mu\iota$), with $\acute{\alpha}$ in one place (Il. II. 559), and the Plpf. forms $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\lambda\pi\epsilon\iota$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\lambda\pi\alpha$, $F\epsilon\lambda\pi$ -), $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\gamma\alpha$, $F\epsilon\rho\gamma$ -), $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha$, $F\iota\kappa$ -). In some of these there may be merely confusion with the later use of the Temporal Augment: e. g. $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\eta\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$ is doubtless due to the Attic $\eta\eta\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$, a form which arose after the loss of f . Hence recent editors write $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$, $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\iota\nu\chi\delta\epsilon\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\iota\varphi\eta\gamma\epsilon\nu$, also $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\lambda\pi\epsilon\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\gamma\epsilon\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota$.

(3) A different explanation is required for $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta$ ($\acute{\alpha}$), supported as it is by Attic $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\rho\omega\nu$ ($\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$) and $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu$ ($\acute{\alpha}$ in $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu\alpha\iota$, &c.)*. These point to an Augment η , the combinations $\eta\phi\sigma$, $\eta f\acute{\alpha}$ passing into $\epsilon\omega$, $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ (as in $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$, $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ for $\eta\phi\sigma$, $\eta f\alpha$). Such an Augment is also found in $\eta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$, $\eta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\delta\epsilon\iota$ (Plpf. of $\sigma\iota\delta\alpha$), and $\eta\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\epsilon$. There is much probability in the suggestion of G. Meyer (G. G. p. 423) that this η is a Temporal Augment obtained from the prothetic $\acute{\epsilon}$ - so often found before f : e. g. in $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ ($F\epsilon\iota\delta$ -). Thus $\eta\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\epsilon$ would be the augmented form of $\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omega$, not of $\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\omega$.

(4) The forms $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\varphi\eta\gamma\epsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\varphi\eta\zeta\epsilon$ are peculiarly difficult on account of the Homeric Pres. $\delta\acute{\iota}\gamma$ - $\nu\eta\mu\iota$, Aor. $\acute{\omega}\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha$, and Lesbian $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\gamma\omega$ (Pres. Inf. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\gamma\eta\nu$, Coll. 214, 43). We might read $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ - $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\gamma\epsilon$, &c., but the ordinary forms $\sigma\acute{\iota}\gamma\omega$ (Hes. Op. 817), $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ - $\sigma\acute{\iota}\gamma\omega$, &c. would still be unexplained.

Initial ρ is nearly always doubled, initial λ , μ , ν , σ very often.

This may often be explained as the assimilation of an original initial f or σ : thus $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\eta\zeta\alpha$ is for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $F\rho\eta\zeta\alpha$, and so $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\epsilon\zeta\epsilon$ ($F\epsilon\rho\gamma$ -) and $F\rho\epsilon\gamma$ -), $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon$ ($F\rho\acute{\iota}\gamma$ -). Again $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\epsilon\epsilon\nu$ is for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\sigma\rho\epsilon\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\epsilon\sigma\upsilon\nu$ for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\sigma\nu\epsilon\sigma\upsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon$ perhaps for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\sigma\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon$ (Joh. Schmidt, *Pluralb.* p. 434). So $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$ (which Ar. wrote $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$) is for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\delta\phi\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$: and $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu\alpha$ probably for $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\kappa\iota\epsilon\nu\alpha$ (Sanskrit root $\kappa\gamma\upsilon$). So too in $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\gamma\delta\sigma\upsilon\pi\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ the γ reappears which is lost in the unaugmented $\delta\sigma\upsilon\pi\eta\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$.

There are instances, however, to which this explanation does not apply, as $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon$. These are probably due to the influence of forms such as those already mentioned upon the traditional poetic dialect (Curtius, *Stud.* iv. 479 ff.; for a different view see Hartel's *Homerische Studien*). Cp. § 371.

68.] The Pluperfect. The Perfect Stem forms the corresponding Historical or Past Tense—the Pluperfect—in two ways:—

1. Simply, with the Augment (often omitted) and the Secondary Person-Endings. All Middle forms of the Tense are of this kind, as $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\nu\kappa$ - $\tau\omicron$, $\acute{\epsilon}\phi$ - $\acute{\eta}\pi\tau\omicron$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ - $\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, $\acute{\eta}\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha$ - $\tau\omicron$. In the Active the examples are comparatively few, viz. $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon$ (Il. 18. 34), $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\eta}\nu\theta\epsilon\nu$ (Il. II. 266), and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi$ - $\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\nu\theta\epsilon$ (Il. 2. 219); Plur. $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta$ - $\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$ - $\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$ - $\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha$ - $\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha$ - $\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha$ - $\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ - $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\alpha$ - $\sigma\alpha\nu$; Dual $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\kappa$ - $\tau\eta\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ - $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}$ - $\tau\eta\nu$.

* $\acute{\eta}\lambda\omega$ was taken (Od. 22. 230 $\sigma\acute{\eta}$ δ' $\acute{\eta}\lambda\omega$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}$ $\kappa\tau\lambda.$) should perhaps be written $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega$. The Stem $f\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega$ - appears in the Moods ($\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\phi\eta\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$), except in the form $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon$ (Il. 5. 487), where the metre requires $\acute{\alpha}$.

With these may be placed the Thematic forms $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu\epsilon$ (Il. 14. 469), $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\omicron\text{-}\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon$, $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\omicron\text{-}\nu$, $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\epsilon\text{-}\tau\omicron$, $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\eta\kappa\omicron\nu$, in Hesiod $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\upsilon\kappa\omicron\nu$: see § 27.

2. By Composition, with the Augment and the Suffix $\text{-}\epsilon\alpha$ (probably for $\text{-}\epsilon\sigma\alpha$), joined to the longer form of the Stem : e.g. $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\tau\epsilon\theta\acute{\eta}\pi\text{-}\epsilon\alpha$, $\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\theta\epsilon\alpha$, $\acute{\eta}\nu\acute{\omega}\gamma\text{-}\epsilon\alpha$. The 3 Sing. usually has $\text{-}\epsilon\epsilon(\nu)$ contracted $\text{-}\epsilon\iota(\nu)$, as $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\theta\epsilon\iota$, $\acute{\eta}\nu\acute{\omega}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\delta\epsilon\delta\acute{\eta}\epsilon\iota$, $\acute{\eta}\rho\acute{\eta}\rho\epsilon\iota$, $\beta\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\iota$. The Plur. occurs only once in Homer, in $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\kappa\text{-}\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ (Il. 13. 102) : the Dual never.

To this group belongs $\acute{\eta}\delta\epsilon\alpha$ *I knew*, 2 Sing. $\acute{\eta}\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$ (for $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\text{F}\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$), also $\acute{\eta}\delta\eta\sigma\theta\alpha$, 3 Sing. $\acute{\eta}\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\iota$, $\acute{\eta}\delta\epsilon\iota$ (or, as Aristarchus read, $\acute{\eta}\epsilon\iota\delta\eta$, $\acute{\eta}\delta\eta$). As to the augment $\acute{\eta}\text{-}$ see § 67. In respect of form $\acute{\eta}\delta\epsilon\alpha$ is a Sigmatic Aorist, standing for $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\text{F}\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\sigma\alpha$, Sanscr. *ávedisham*, and is only a Pluperfect because it is used as the past tense answering to $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$ (*M. U.* iii. p. 16).

69.] Loss of Augment. The Augment is so often dropped in Homer that the augmented and the unaugmented forms are almost equally numerous. It has been observed however* that the forms without the Augment are comparatively rare in the speeches, the proportion of augmented to unaugmented forms (excluding speeches which mainly consist of narrative matter) being about 10 to 3, whereas in narrative it is about 5 to 7. It would appear therefore that the Augment is chiefly omitted where the context shows that past time is meant; and this is confirmed by the remarkable fact that the Iteratives, which are only used as Historical Tenses, do not take the Augment.

The only clear instance of an Iterative form with the Augm. is $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\mu\omicron\sigma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\text{-}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ (Od. 20. 7). On the forms $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\phi\alpha\sigma\kappa\omicron\text{-}\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\phi\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon$ see § 49.

Meaning of the Present and Aorist Stems.

70.] The forms which contain the Present Stem (the Present and Imperfect Indic., with the Moods of the Present) denote *progressive* action (incipient, continued, repeated, &c.), as opposed to a *single* fact or event.

It is easy to understand why a language which distinguished these two kinds of action should have no Aorist for present time (* $\beta\acute{\eta}\mu$, * $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\omega$, &c.). The present is not a space of time, but a point; what is present therefore is not (generally speaking) a whole action or event, but the fact that it is in course of happening. So in English we usually say, not *I write now*, but *I am writing now*. The mere effort of regarding an action as in present time almost obliges us to give it a progressive character.

The forms $\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\iota}$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu$, $\phi\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$, $\gamma\acute{\rho}\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega$, &c., in which the Stem has the form generally found only in Aorists (§ 11, § 30), may be regarded as surviving

* Konrad Koch, *De Augmento apud Homerum omisso*, Brunswick, 1868.

instances of the 'Present Aorist,' i.e. of a Present not conveying the notion of progress. We may compare the English use of *I am*, *I go* (now archaic in the sense of *I am going*), *I say* (*says he*), &c. In these cases the use of a distinctly progressive form has not been felt to be necessary.

A past action may usually be regarded, if we choose, as a single fact, irrespective of its duration (*ἔβασιλευσεν ἔτη τριάκοντα* *he reigned*, not *he continued reigning*). But an action which is thought of as contemporary with some other event is almost necessarily regarded as progressive. Accordingly, answering to the Present *I am writing* (*now*), we have the Past Tense *I was writing* (*when he came*).

It follows from what has been said that a Pres. or Impf. may be used either (1) because the action intended is essentially progressive, or (2) because the time is fixed by reference (*a*) to the moment of speaking, or (*β*) to a point of time in the past. *E.g.* *δίδωμι* may mean either *I seek to give*, *I offer*, or *I am giving*; *ἔδιδου* either *he offered* or *he was giving*. In the second of these uses the notion of progress is only *relative*, arising from the relation of time under which the action is thought of*.

71.] From the relative notion of progress or continuance is derived the general rule that the Impf. is used of a *subordinate* action or circumstance: Il. 8. 87 ὄφρ' ὁ γέρων ἀπέταμνε τόφρ' Ἔκτορος ὠκέες ἵπποι ἦλθον *while he was cutting the chariot came*.

Some varieties of this use may be noticed:—

(1) The Impf. shows that a Verb stands in a special connexion with the Verb of another clause; Il. 1. 3–5 ψυχὰς Ἀϊδὶ προΐαψεν ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν *sent down the souls of heroes to Hades, while it made themselves a prey to dogs*.

Od. 8. 532 ἐνθ' ἄλλους μὲν πάντας ἐλάνθανε δάκρυα λείβων, Ἀλκίνοος δὲ μιν οἷος ἐπεφράσατ' ἡδ' ἐνόησε *while he was unobserved by the others, Alcinous observed him*.

So Il. 7. 303 ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας δῶκε ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον,
Αἴας δὲ ζωστήρα δίδου (*gave in exchange*).

Od. 8. 63 τὸν περὶ Μοῦσ' ἐφίλησε, δίδου δ' ἀγαθὸν τε κακὸν τε,
ὀφθαλμῶν μὲν ἄμερσε, δίδου δ' ἡδέϊαν ἀοιδήν.

(2) In *oratio obliqua*, as Il. 22. 439 ἡγγειλ' ὅττι ρά οἱ πόσις
ἔκθοι μίμνε πυλάων.

(3) The action or point of time to which the Verb in the Impf. is subordinate may be merely implied:—

Il. 4. 155 θάνατόν νύ τοι ὄρκι' ἔταμνον *it was death then to you that I made (in making the treaty)*.

So in the common use with ἄρα: as σὺ δ' οὐκ ἄρα τοῖος ἐησθα *you were not as I thought* (= you are not, it now seems).

* Aken, *Hauptdata*, p. 9.

72.] **Essentially progressive action** (incomplete or continuous) is exemplified—

(1) In the Verbs which form the Aor. from a different Verb-Stem: *ὄρώ* *I watch* (Lat. *tueor*, whereas *εἶδον* means *I descried*); *λέγω* *I relate, set forth* (but *εἶπον* *I said*); *φέρω* *I carry* (but *ἤνεγκον* *I brought*); so *τρέχω*, *ἔρχομαι* (expressing different kinds of motion).

(2) In other Verbs of motion, esp. *βαλῶ* and *ἵστημι*, as Il. 21. 313 *ἵστη δὲ μέγα κύμα* *raise up a great wave*, and often in the Mid., as Il. 2. 473 *ἐν πεδίῳ ἵσταντο* *were drawn up in the plain*, *παρίστατο* *came and stood beside*, &c.

Note 1. We should read *ἵστασαν* (not *ἵσθᾶσαν* as a First Aor.) in—

Il. 2. 525 *στίχας ἵστασαν* (Bekk., La R., from the best MS.).

12. 56 *τοὺς ἵστασαν υἱὲς Ἀχαιῶν* *which the Greeks had planted*; see § 73.

Od. 3. 180 *τέτρατον ἡμᾶρ ἔην ὅτ' ἐν Ἀργεὶ νῆας ἔϊσας*

Τυδεΐδew ἔταροι . . . ἵστασαν (see Ameis a. l.).

8. 435 *αἱ δὲ λοετροχόον τρίποδ' ἵστασαν*

18. 307 *αὐτίκα λαμπτήρας τρεῖς ἵστασαν*

Bekk., La Roche.

2. The Verb *ἄγω* is often so used: Il. 1. 367 *τὴν δὲ διεπράθομέν τε καὶ ἤγομεν ἐνθάδε πάντα*; Il. 7. 363 *κτήματα δ' ὅσσ' ἀγόμην* *the treasures which I brought* (= *have brought*); Il. 9. 664 *τὴν Λεσβύθεν ἦγε* *whom he had brought*. In this Verb, however, the Aorist meaning appears distinctly in the Participle; Il. 6. 87 *ἡ δὲ ξυνάγουσα γεραίᾶς* *assembling* (= *having assembled*); Il. 1. 311 *εἰσεν ἄγων* *brought and seated* (cp. 3. 48., 4. 392., 11. 827., 22. 350). Perhaps these uses should be connected with the Aoristic form of the Stem (§ 70).

(3) In Verbs expressing the *beginning* of a motion, as *ὤρνυτο* *bestirred himself* (but *ὤρτο* *arose*); *ἀφίει*, *προτεῖ*, *ἔπεμπε*; *μύθων ἤρχε* *began speech*.

This usage extends to all words which imply a continuous result; *κελεύει*, *ἐκέλευε*, *ἐπέτελλε*, *ἦτεε*; *οὐκ ἐᾷ* *will not allow*; *λείπω* (*to leave*=*to keep at home*).

(4) *ἀκούω* and *πύθομαι* sometimes mean *to know by hearing*; as Il. 11. 497 *οὐδέ πω Ἑκτωρ πύθεται* *Hector was not yet aware*: 14. 125 *τὰ δὲ μέλλετ' ἀκούμεν* *ye are like to have heard it*; Od. 3. 87, 187, 193. So in Attic *μανθάνω* *I understand*, *αἰσθάνομαι* *I am aware*, *πυνθάνομαι* *I learn* (Goodwin, § 28).

73.] A process thought of in relation to the present time, or to a point in the past, is expressed by the Impf. (= Engl. *I have been doing, I had been doing*): e. g.—

Il. 6. 282 *μέγα γάρ μιν Ὀλύμπιος ἔτρεφε πῆμα* *has reared him up to be a mischief* (a process). Cp. Il. 1. 414 *τί νύ σ' ἔτρεφον*; *why have I reared thee?* 9. 524 *ἐπυθόμεθα* *we have been accustomed to hear*. So the Participle, Il. 3. 44 *φάντες* *who have been saying*.

74.] The 'historical Present' is not found in Homer, but

somewhat the same effect is often given by the use which may be called the *descriptive* Imperfect. *E.g.*—

Il. 2. 150 νῆας ἔπ' ἐσσεύοντο, ποδῶν δ' ὑπέρερθε κούνη
ἴστατ' αἰερομένη, τοὶ δ' ἀλλήλοισι κέλευον
ἄπτεσθαι νηῶν ἥδ' ἐλκόμεν εἰς ἅλα διαν,
οὔρους τ' ἐξεκάθαιρον κ.τ.λ.

The Impf. appears sometimes to be used in a description along with Aorists for the sake of connexion and variety (*i.e.* in order to avoid a series of detached assertions): *e.g.* in Il. 1. 437-439., 2. 43-45., 4. 112-119, Od. 4. 577-580.

75.] The Aorist gives the meaning of a Verb without the accessory notion of progress or continuance. It does not *describe*, or transport us to a time in the past when the action was present (as the Impf. does), but makes us think of it as *now past*. Hence it asserts a *single* occurrence,—an action, or series of actions, regarded as an undivided whole,—or *completion*, a *culminating point*, in which the action is summed up. Thus μοιῶ I am toiling, ἐμόγησα (Il. 1. 162) I have toiled; νοέω I think of, ἐνόησε perceived, understood; θαρσέω I feel confident, θαρσήςσας taking courage, and so δείσας, ἀλγήςσας, μίσσησε, νεμέσησε, &c., of the access of a feeling; δηριωθήτην (Il. 16. 756) joined in strife; πατήνσας casting a glance; φωνήσας either raising his voice or having spoken: ἔπ' ἡματι δακρύσαντες (Il. 19. 229) performing the due weeping for the day.

76.] The Aorist is often used in Homer of the immediate past—that which in an especial sense is thought of as *now past*:—

Il. 2. 114 νῦν δὲ κακὴν ἀπάτην βουλεύσατο, καὶ με κελεύει
δυσκλέα Ἄργος ἱκέσθαι.

Od. 1. 182 νῦν δ' ὄδε ξὺν νηὶ κατήλυθον (cp. 23. 27).

Il. 20. 16 τίπτ' αὐτ', ἀργικέραυνε, θεοὺς ἀγορήνδε κάλεσσας;

Sometimes the Aor. seems to give the question a tone of impatience: Il. 2. 323 τίπτ' ἄνεω ἐγένεσθε; 4. 243 τίφθ' οὕτως ἔστητε τεθηπότες; (vulg. ἔστητε, an impossible form), cp. 20. 178 τί νῦν τόσσον ὁμίλου πολλὸν ἐπελθὼν ἔστης; 21. 562., 22. 122., Od. 4. 810., 10. 64. Cp. the Attic use of τί οὐ, as Soph. O. T. 1002 τί δῆρ' ἐγὼ οὐχὶ . . . ἐξελευσάμην; (Goodwin, § 62).

When the Aor. is used of an action which is subordinate to another in the past, it implies completion before the main action: Il. 2. 642 οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτ' αὐτὸς ἔην, θάνε δὲ ξανθὸς Μελέαγρος *he was no longer living, and yellow-haired Meleager had died*.

A similar use of the Aor. is regular in the Subj., as Il. 1. 168 ἐπεὶ κε κάμω *when I have grown weary*: and in the Participle, as ὡς εἰπὼν *having thus spoken*. The Aor. in these uses expresses, not past time as such (with reference to the moment of speak-

ing), but *completion* with reference to (*i.e.* usually before) the time of the principal Verb.

77.] The Participle of the Aor. is sometimes used to express *exact coincidence* with the action of the principal Verb: as βῆ δὲ αἰξάσα went with a spring, ψευσαμένη προσηύδα spoke a lie, ἄλτο λαθὼν leaped unseen. Here a Pres. Part. would imply that there was a *distinct subordinate action*: the Aor. expresses something that *coincides* with, or is *part of*, the main action.

This is especially found with Verbs expressing the manner (tone, gesture, &c.) with which a thing is said or done: Il. 6. 54 ὁμοκλήσας ἔπος ἡῦδα shouted the words; Il. 8. 219 ποιπνύσαντι θεῶς ὀτρύναι Ἀχαιοὺς to make hot haste in stirring up the Greeks; Il. 13. 597 χεῖρα παρακρεμάσας: Il. 10. 139., 16. 474., 17. 334., 20. 161, Od. 2. 422., 17. 330 (cp. φεύγειν παρασείσαντι Arist. Eth. Nic. 4. 3. 15).

78.] The Aor. sometimes appears to be used of present time.

(1) As in—

Il. 14. 95 νῦν δέ σευ ὠνοσάμην πάγχυ φρένας οἶον ἔειπες.

The Aor. here expresses a *culminating point*, reached in the immediate past, or rather at the moment of speaking: *I have been brought to the point of blaming*, *i.e.* *I blame*.

Il. 20. 306 ἦδη . . ἤχθηρε has now come to hate.

Il. 3. 415 τῶς δέ σ' ἀπεχθήρω ὥς νῦν ἔκπαγλ' ἐφίλησα come to hate you as I now love you (lit. have got to love; cp. Od. 8. 481).

So ἔπλετο has come to be, is (§ 32); Attic ἦσθην, ἐπήνεσα, &c. In these cases the Aor. is used because the stress is on the nature of the action as something completed, though the completion is in present time*.

By a slight boldness of expression the Aor. may even be used of an event completed in future time:—

Il. 9. 412 εἰ μὲν κ' αἴθι μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
ὦλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἀφθιτον ἔσται.

= *my return will have been lost*, *i.e.* *will be ipso facto lost*. The

* So Eur. Med. 791 ἔμωφα, I. A. 510 ἀπέπνυσα: where, as Aken observes, 'die Handlung geschieht erst mit dem Aussprechen' (Grundz. § 18). These Aorists are sometimes explained of the past time at which the action began. As a reviewer of the former edition put it, 'Greek speakers, in describing feelings excited by the previous remarks of other speakers, frequently refer those feelings to the time when they were felt, and not to the present time of the description' (Saturday Rev., Feb. 17, 1883). That is to say, ἐπήνεσα means *I praised (when I heard)*. But this kind of subordination to a past event is precisely what is expressed by the Impf., not the Aor. The reviewer goes on to explain ἔπλετο in Il. 19. 57 by the presence of the particle ἄρ (ἦ ἄρ τι τόδ' ἔπλετο *this was as we can now see*), 'as in the common ἦν ἄρα'. This would only be possible if ἔπλετο were an Impf.; see § 33.

speaker puts himself at the (future) point of time given by the context, and uses the Tense which then becomes appropriate.

(2) Again—

When an assertion is made irrespective of time, the Pres. or Aor. is used—the Pres. for continuous and the Aor. for single or momentary action. Hence the use—

In similes, as Il. 3. 23 ὥστε λέων ἐχάρη *as a lion is gladdened* (but in v. 25 κατεσθίει *goes on devouring*): Il. 4. 75 οἶον δ' ἀστέρα ἦκε . . τοῦ δέ τε πολλοὶ ἀπὸ σπινθῆρες ἔνται.

The only examples of the Impf. in a simile are Il. 15. 274., 21. 495, in the phrase οὐδ' ἄρα . . αἰσμον ἦεν, where it is virtually a Present.

Also in 'gnomic' passages, reflexions, general sayings, &c.:

Il. 1. 218 ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπείθεται μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ.

9. 320 κάτθαν' ὁμῶς ὃ τ' ἄεργος ἀνὴρ, ὃ τε πολλὰ ἐοργῶς.

These uses of the Aor. are very common in Homer.

The Impf. may possibly be found in a gnomic passage, Il. 13. 730-732—

ἀλλ' αὖ μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκε θεὸς πολέμια ἔργα

ἀλλ' αὖ δ' ἐν στήθεσσι τιθεὶ νόον εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς,

where the MS. reading τίθει may be defended as an Impf. marking subordination to the Aor. ἔδωκε: cp. the examples in § 71. 2.

Much light has been thrown upon the history of the Aorist by the comparison of the use in Sanscrit (Delbrück, *S. F.* ii, and *A. S.* p. 280). If the result has not been to determine the original force of the Aorist, it has at least shown that the question cannot be settled from the material furnished by Greek alone. The use which predominates in Greek, the historical use to assert the happening of a single event in the past, is almost unknown to the earliest Sanscrit. In the Veda the Aor. is employed, as often in Homer (§ 74), of what has happened in the *immediate* past. In the early Sanscrit prose (the Brāhmaṇas) the Aor. is used of what has happened to the speaker himself. It is worth noticing that these uses, in which the Aor. answers approximately to the English Pf. with *have*, are found in later Greek in the case of the verbs whose Pf. retains its original meaning. As Mr. Gildersleeve puts it, 'when the Perfect is used as a Present, the Aorist is used as a Perfect. So ἐκτησάμην *I have gained possession of, κέκτημαι I possess*' (*Am. Journ. of Phil.* iv. 429). Hence, if the Greek Perfect is originally a kind of present, there is a presumption that the Aor. was originally akin in meaning to our Perfect. On this view the ordinary historical Aor. is a derivative use.

CHAPTER III.

THE MOODS.

79.] The Moods of the Verb (properly so called) are the *Subjunctive*, the *Optative*, and the *Imperative*. It is convenient however to rank the two Verbal Nouns, the *Infinitive* and the

Participle, along with them. The meanings of the Moods and Verbal Nouns cannot well be discussed until we come to the chapters dealing with Complex Sentences.

The Subjunctive.

80.] Non-Thematic Tense-Stems usually form the Subj. by taking the Thematic Vowel, with the Primary Endings; except that when the Thematic Vowel enters into a diphthong, or is followed by two consonants, it becomes *η* or *ω* instead of *ε* or *ο*. Thus the scheme is—

Sing.		Dual.		Plur.	
Act.	Mid.	Act.	Mid.	Act.	Mid.
-ω	-ομαι	-ετον	-ησθον	-ιμεν	-όμεθα, -όμεσθα
-ης	-εαι			-ετε	-ησθε
-η (-ησι?)	-εται			-ωσι(ν)	-ωνται.

The long *η* or *ω*, it will be seen, comes in place of *ε* or *ο* wherever it can do so without disturbing the metre. Examples:—

Strong Aorists: *ξ-φθη*, Subj. *φθή-η*:

ξ-βη, Subj. *βή-ω* (or *βείω*), *ὑπερ-βή-η*, *βή-ομεν* (or *βεί-ομεν*):

ξ-στη, Subj. *στή-ης*, *στή-η*, *στή-ετον*, *στή-ομεν*, *στή-ωσι*:

ξ-γνώ, Subj. *γνώ-ω*, *γνώ-ομεν*, *γνώ-ωσι*:

ξ-δν, Subj. *δύω*, *δύ-ης*, *δύη*:

ξ-βλη-το, Subj. *βλή-εται*:

ξ-φθι-το, Subj. *φθι-εται*, *φθι-όμεσθα*:

ἄλ-το, Subj. *ἄλ-εται*:

Stem *θη-*, Subj. *θεί-ω* (or *θή-ω*), *θή-ης*, *θεί-ομεν* (or *θή-ομεν*), *ἀπο-θεί-ομαι*:

Stem *ή-*, Subj. *έφ-εί-ω*, *ἀν-ή-η*:

Stem *δω-*, Subj. *δώ-η* and *δώ-ησι*, *δώ-ομεν*, *δώ-ωσι*.

Presents: *είμι*, Subj. *έ-ω* (for *έσ-ω*), *έ-ης*, *έ-η* and *έ-ησι*, *έ-ωσι*:

εί-μι, Subj. *ί-ω*, *ί-ησθα*, *ί-ησι*, *ί-ομεν* (*ί*):

φη-μί, Subj. *φή-η*:

κιχῆ-ναι, Subj. *κικεί-ω*, *κικεί-ομεν* (or *κική-ω*, *κική-ομεν*):

so *έρεί-ομεν* as if from **έρη-μι*.

Passive Aorists: *ξ-δάμη*, Subj. *δαμεί-ω*, *δαμή-ης*, *δαμή-ετε*:

so *δαεί-ω*, *ἄλῶ-ω*, *ἄλῶ-η*, *σαπή-η*, *φανή-η*, *τραπέι-ομεν*.

For *δαινύη*, 2 Sing. Subj. Mid. (Od. 8. 243., 19. 328), we may read *δαινύε*, *i. e.* *δαινύ-ε-αι*.

Perfects: *πέποιθα*, Subj. *πεποίθ-ης*, *πεποίθ-ομεν*: *έρριγε*, Subj. *έρρίγ-ησι*: *βέβηκε*, Subj. *προ-βεβήκ-η*: so *έστήκ-η*, *άρήρ-η*, *μεμήλ-η*, *δλώλ-η*, *δρώρ-η*, *βεβούχ-η*: also *ίλήκησι* (Od. 21. 365.)—unless we assume a Pres. *ίλήκω* (§ 45).

Pf. Mid. *προσ-αρήρεται* (Hes. Op. 431).

οίδα, Subj. *είδέω*, *είδῃς*, *είδῃ*, *είδομεν*, *είδετε*, *είδῶσι*.

For εἶδω, &c., Tyrannio wrote εἶδω, εἶδης, εἶδη, εἶδωσι (Schol. Od. i. 174), uniform with εἶδομεν, εἶδετε. Both forms may be accounted for: εἶδω is Subj. of ἔ-φείδεα (§ 68); εἶδω with the Plur. εἶδ-ο-μεν, εἶδ-ε-τε, is Subj. of a Non-Thematic *φείδ-μι, Sanscr. *ved-mi* (*M. U.* iii. 18). The form ἰδῶ, read by most MSS. in Il. 14. 235, is a mere error for εἶδῶ.

Aorists in -σά: ἔ-βήσα-μεν, Subj. βήσ-ομεν: ἡγείρα, Subj. ἀγείρ-ομεν: ἔ-τισα, Subj. τίσ-ετε, τίσ-ωσι: ἡμείψα-το, Subj. ἀμείψ-εται: ἡλεύα-το, Subj. ἀλεύ-εται: and many more. These Subjunctives properly belong to the older inflexion of the Sigmatic Aorist without -ᾱ (§ 40).

To these should be added some forms used as Futures:—

ἔδ-ο-μαι, ἔδονται *shall eat* (cp. Sanscr. *ad-mi*, Lat. *est* for *ed-t*).

δῆ-εις, δῆ-ομεν, δῆ-ετε *shall find*, with the strong Stem answering to δᾶ(σ)- in δέδαεν, &c.

βεί-ο-μαι *shall live*, from the stem βίφ-; also in the form βέομαι. Evidently βείομαι: βιῶναι: δῆω: δαῖναι.

It will be found that the Homeric uses of these words are all such as can be referred to the Subj. On πίομαι and κέω see § 59. The form δῆεις may be a trace of an older inflexion, -ω, -εις, -ει, answering to -ομεν, -ετε.

It will be seen that the strong form of the Stem is found in the Subjunctive, as φή-η, δώ-ομεν, ἐστήκ-η. Apparent exceptions are, (1) the Subj. of εἶμι—in which the ι of ἵομεν (for εἰ-ομεν) is unexplained, while the forms ἱ-ω, ἱ-ησι may be Thematic, (as are Opt. ἵοι, Part. ἰών); and (2) the forms ἀφ-έ-η (Aor. of ἀφ-ίη-μι), μύγέ-ωσι, φθέ-ωσι, στέ-ωμεν, κτέ-ωμεν, φθέ-ωμεν, θέ-ωμεν, ἔ-ωμεν. These forms are the result of transference of quantity, στε-ω- for στή-ο-, &c., and it is important to notice that the last six are always scanned as disyllables, thus forming the transition to the contracted φθῶσι, στῶμεν, &c.

Anomalous lengthening is found in μετ-είω (Il. 23. 47) for μετ-έ-ω.

On the ει for η in βεί-ω, θεί-ω, δαμεί-ω, &c. see Append. C.

81.] Subjunctives with lengthened Stem-vowel. The formation of the Subj. by means of the Thematic vowel must have been confined originally to Stems ending in a consonant, or in one of the vowels *i, u*. The hiatus in such forms as φή-η, στή-ομεν, γνώ-ομεν is enough to prove that they are not primitive. In Vedic Sanscrit, accordingly, while *as-a-ti*, *han-a-ti* are Subj. of *as-ti*, *han-ti*, we find *sthā-ti*, *dā-ti* as the Subj. answering to the Aorists *á-sthā-t*, *á-dā-t*. These would become in Homer στή-σι, δῶ-σι or (with the usual ι of the 3 Sing.) στή-σι, δῶ-σι. Similarly we may infer an original Plural στήμεν, στήτε, στήντι (στήσι); δῶμεν, δῶτε, δῶντι (δῶσι); and so on. The principle of the formation is that the Stem ends in a simple long vowel—not one that has arisen from specifically Greek contraction.

Traces of this type of Subj. are found in the Greek dialects: *δύνῃ-μαι* (for *δύνωμαι*), *καθ-ίστῃ-ται*, *προ-τίθηντι*, &c. (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 502). In Homer it may be recognised in the 3 Sing. forms *φῆσιν* (Od. i. 168), *φθῆσι* (Il. 23. 805), *ῆσι* (Il. 15. 359), *μεθ-ίησι* (Il. 13. 234), *δῶσι*; perhaps in *δῶ*, *δῶς*, *δῶμεν*, *δῶσι*, *περι-δῶμεθον*, *ἐπι-δῶμεθα*; *γνῶς*, *γνῶμεν*, *γνῶσι*; *ἐπι-βῆτον*, *πειρηθῆτον*, &c.—which are usually regarded as contracted from the regular Homeric *δῶω*, *δῶης*, *δῶομεν*, &c.—and in *δύνη-ται*, *ἐπί-στηται* (§ 87, 3).

How then did the Homeric forms of the type of *φή-η*, *στή-ομεν*, *γνώ-ομεν* arise? Doubtless by a new application of the process already familiar in *ἴο-μεν* (*εἶ-μι*), *φθί-ε-ται*, *χρύ-ε-ται*, *πεποίθ-ο-μεν*, &c. We may compare the extension of the Endings *-ᾄται*, *-ᾄτο* to the Pf. *βεβλή-αται*, in imitation of *κεκλί-αται*, *εἰρύ-αται* (§ 5).

Contraction appears in the 3 Sing. *φῆ* (Od. 19. 122), *στῆ* (Od. 18. 334), *βῆ* (Od. 2. 358), *φανῆ* (Il. 9. 707), *γνῶ* (Il. 1. 411., 16. 273)—unless we suppose that these are obtained by dropping the *-σι* of *φῆ-σι*, &c. on the analogy of the Thematic *-η*. Also in the 1 Plur. *μεθ-ῶμεν* (Il. 10. 449), *συν-ῶμεθα* (Il. 13. 381), *δαῶμεν* (Il. 2. 299), *μεμν-ῶμεθα* (Od. 14. 168; and the 3 Plur. *ῶσι* (Il. 14. 274, Od. 24. 491), *βῶσι* (Od. 14. 86); but it is probably more correct to write these words with *εω* (like *φθέωσι*, *ξωμεν*, &c.), except when a vowel precedes (as in *δαῶμεν*).

The two forms of the Subj. present a certain analogy to the two kinds of derivative Verbs—the Attic *-αω*, *-ωι*, *-οω*, and the Æolic *-ᾶμι*, *-ημι*, *-ωμι*. Thus *δύνῃ-μαι*, *τίθην-τι* are related to *δύνω-μαι*, *τιθέωσι* nearly as *φίλημεν*, *φίλεισι* to *φιλέομεν*, *φιλέουσιν*.

κείται occurs as a Subj. in Il. 19. 32., 24. 554, Od. 2. 102., 19. 147. It has been explained as contracted from *κεί-εται*, the regular form answering to the Non-Thematic *κεί-ται* (*Curt. Stud.* vii. 100). The best MS. (Ven. A of the Iliad) gives *κῆται*. The true reading is probably *κείται* (related to *κείται* as *τελέω* to *τελείω*).

ζώννυνται, construed with *ὅτε κεν* (Od. 24. 89) is regarded by Curtius as a Subj. (*Verb.* ii. 67). But the example is uncertain; the clause refers to past time, so that *ὅτε κεν* with the Subj. is quite irregular (§ 298).

σῶφ and *σῶψ* or *σοῶψ* (Il. 9. 424, 681) are probably Optatives; see § 83.

82.] Thematic Tense-Stems form the Subj. by changing *ε* into *η* and *ο* into *ω*.

The Subjunctive of the Thematic Aor. and Pres. frequently employs the Person-Endings *-μι* and *-σι*: e.g. *ἐθέλ-ωμι*, *ἐθέλ-ησι*; *εἰπωμι*, *εἰπῃσι*; *ἀγάγωμι*, *ἀγάγησι*; *τύχωμι*, *τύχησι*; *ἵδωμι*, *κτείνωμι*; *ἄγησι*, *ἀεῖδῃσι*, *ἄρχῃσι*, *ἀλάλκῃσι*, *βάλῃσι*, *ἐλῃσι*, *κάμῃσι*, &c. (Bekker, *H. B.* i. 218). These Endings are also found (but rarely) with Non-Thematic Stems: Pres. *ξ-ῃσι*, *ἰ-ῃσι* (which however may be Thematic), Aor. *δῶ-ῃσι* (Il. 1. 324), Pf. *ἐρρίγ-ῃσι*

(Il. 3. 353). The 2 Sing. sometimes takes -σθᾶ; ἐθέλ-ησθα, εἴπ-ησθα, πῆλσθα, &c.

The Subj. in -ωμι had almost disappeared at one time from the text of Homer, having been generally corrupted into -οιμι, sometimes -ωμαι. It was restored by Wolf, chiefly on the authority of the ancient grammarians. Some of the best MSS. (especially Ven. A) have occasionally preserved it.

It is interesting to observe the agreement in form between the Thematic Indic. and the Non-Thematic Subj.; e.g. Indic. ἄγω and Subj. γνῶ-ω, in contrast to Subj. ἐθέλω-μι: just as ἄγο-μεν and γνῶ-ομεν agree in contrast to ἄγω-μεν.

A few forms of the Aorist in -σᾶ follow the analogy of the Thematic Stems, as ὄρσ-ωμεν (Il. 7. 38), ὄρσ-ητε (Il. 23. 210), δηλήσ-ηται (Il. 3. 107), μνησώμεθα (Il. 15. 477, &c.), παύσωμεν (Il. 7. 29), παυσώμεσθα (Il. 7. 290., 21. 467), πέμψωμεν (Od. 20. 383), ἐνιπλήσωμεν (Il. 12. 72), φθίσωμεν (Od. 16. 369), περάσῃτε (Od. 15. 453), ἀντιάσῃτον (Il. 12. 356), τρώσῃτε (Od. 16. 293., 19. 12), δεισῃτε (Il. 24. 779), βουλεύσωμεν (Od. 16. 234).

In most of these instances the original reading is probably either a Pres. Subj. or an Opt. Thus in Il. 21. 467 the best MSS. have παυώμεσθα, and in Od. 20. 383 there is good authority for πέμπωμεν (in Il. 15. 72 the MSS. are divided between παύω and παύσω). Similarly we may read παύωμεν and ἐνιπλήσσωμεν. Again φθίσωμεν follows a Past Tense (§ 298), περάσῃτε an Opt. (§ 308, 1, b): read φθίσαιμεν, περάσαιτε. For ἀντιάσῃτον we may have either the Opt. ἀντιάσαιτον or a Pres. Subj. ἀντιάητον. For τρώσῃτε we should perhaps read τρώητε (cp. the Pres. Ind. τρώει), and for βουλεύσωμεν βουλεύωμεν.

There are no clear instances of Thematic Stems forming the Subjunctive with a short vowel (ε or ο).

The forms μίσγειαι, κατίσχειαι (Il. 2. 232, 233), for μίσσγειαι, κατίσσχειαι, are like βέβληται (Il. 11. 380) in which the η forms a short syllable.

In Il. 14. 484 τῷ καὶ κέ τις εὔχεται ἀνὴρ κτλ. Hermann's conjecture καὶ τέ τις is found in two of La Roche's MSS., and in any case the κε is unsuitable to the sense. The true reading is probably καὶ τίς τ' (§ 332).

In Od. 4. 672 ὡς ἂν ἐπισμυγεῖται ναυτίλλεται write ναυτίλλεται, the Aor. Subj.

Three places remain to be mentioned:

- Il. 1. 66 αἶ κέν πως ἀρνῶν κνίσῃσι αἰγῶν τε τελείων
βούλεται ἀντιάσας ἡμῖν ἀπὸ λοιγὸν ἀμύνειν.

Curtius adopts the suggestion of Stier, βούλητ' ἀντιάσας (Curt. Stud. ii. 138).

- Il. 10. 360 ὡς δ' ὅτε καρχαρόδοντε δῶν κύνε, εἰδότε θήρῃς,
ἢ κεμάδ' ἢ ἐλαγῶν ἐπείγετον ἐμμενὲς αἰεὶ
χάρων ἀν' ὕληνθ', ὃ δέ τε προθέησι μεμηκῶς.

Here ἐπείγετον is difficult because the Subj. προθέησι is used in the next clause. Possibly the author of book 10 used the archaic form in -ησι as an Indicative.

- Il. 12. 42 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἐν τε κύνεσσι καὶ ἀνδράσι θηρευτῇσι
κάπριος ἢ ἐλέων στρέφεται.

The use of ὅτ' ἂν in a simile is doubtful in Homer (see § 289). Should we read ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἔναντα? Cp. Il. 20. 67.

The Optative.

83.] The Optative Stem is formed from the Tense Stem by the Suffix *ιη* or *ι*, as *διδό-ιη-ν*, *τύχο-ι-το*.

1. Non-Thematic Tenses (except the Aorist in *-σα*) take *ιη* before Light Endings, *ι* before Heavy Endings; as *εἰη-ν* (for *ἔσ-ιη-ν*), *θε-ίη-ν*, *δο-ίη*, *κιχε-ίη*, *τεθνα-ίη-s*, *δαμε-ίη*; but Plur. *φα-ί-μεν*, *δια-κοσμηθε-ί-μεν*, *ἐπι-θε-ί-τε*.

The 3 Plur. ends in *-ιεν*, as *ε-ίεν*, *δαμε-ίεν*, *δο-ίεν*: once *-ιη-σαν*, viz. *στα-ίησαν* (Il. 17. 733).

The *ι* is lost in *δύη* (Od. 9. 377., 18. 348., 20. 286, for *δν-ιη*), *ἐκ-δύμεν*, *λελύτο* (Od. 18. 238 La Roche), *δαινύτο* (Il. 24. 665), *δαινύ-ατο* (Od. 18. 248), *φθίτο*, *ἀπο-φθίμην* (for *φθι-ι-το*, *ἀπο-φθι-ι-μην*).

2. In Thematic Tenses the scheme of Endings is:—

	Sing.		Dual.		Plur.
1. -οιμι	Mid. -οίμην	. . .	Mid. . . .	-οιμεν	Mid. -οίμεθα
2. -οις	-οιο	-οιτον	-οισθον	-οιτε	-οισθε
3. -οι	-οιτο	-οίτην	-οίστην	-οιεν	-οιάτο.

3. The Aorist in *-σα* forms the Optative in two ways—

(1) In *-σαιᾶ* the (so-called) Æolic Optative.

(2) In *-σαι-μι* with Endings as in the Thematic Tenses, putting *α* for *ο* throughout.

The scheme of the Homeric forms is:—

1 Sing. -αιμι	Plur. -αιμεν
2 „ -ειᾶs, rarely -αις	„ -αιτε
3 „ -ειε(ν), sometimes -αι	„ -ειᾶν (-αιεν Il. 24. 38).

The Mid. Endings are of the second kind, *-αίμην*, *-αιο*, *-αιτο*, &c.

The Perfect forms the Opt. from the weak Stem, as *τετλα-ίη*, *τεθνα-ίη-s*, *ἔστα-ίη*. The Opt. of *οἶδα* is formed (like the Plpf., see § 68, 2) from an Aor. *ἔ-ἦειδε-σα* (*εἰδείη-ν* for *ἦειδεσ-ιη-ν*).

The instances of the Pf. Opt. with Thematic *-οι-μι*, *-οι-s*, &c. are doubtful. *βεβλήκοι* is the reading of Aristarchus in Il. 8. 270, where the best MSS. have *βεβλήκει*. In Il. 21. 609 *γνώμεναι ὅς τε πεφύγοι ὅς τ' ἔθαν' κτλ.*, the reading *πεφύγει* is given by one good MS. (D.), and evidently agrees better with *ἔθανε*. *βεβρώθεις* (Il. 4. 35) points to a form *βέβρωθα*, of which however there is no other evidence. *ιλήκοι* (H. Apoll. 165) may be Pf. or Pres.

Irregular forms:—

Thematic *ἔοι-s*, *ἔοι* (Il. 9. 142, 284), *ἔοι* (Il. 14. 21), *δίοι-το* (Od. 17. 317). Homer has also *ιε-ίη* (Il. 19. 209), to be compared with *εἰδείη*, *δεδείη*.

The so-called 'Æolic' Opt. of Contracted Verbs (-ψη-ν, -οιη-ν) appears in *φιλοίη* (Od. 4. 692) and *φοροίη* (Od. 9. 320).

In Il. 14. 241 most authorities give *ἐπισχοίης* as an Opt. (*τῷ κεν ἐπισχοίης λιπαροὺς πόδας εἰλαπινάζων*). Three of the chief MSS. (A. B. C.) have *ἐπίσχοιες*, and this was quoted by Herodian, apparently as the only reading known to him (see Ludwich, *A.H.T.* i. 374). The Syr. palimpsest has *ἐπίσχοιας*. All three forms are anomalous; *ἐπισχοίης* finds a parallel in *ἀγαγοίην* (Sappho) and one or two other forms, but can hardly be Homeric.

The forms *σός* (Il. 9. 681), *σῶ* (Il. 9. 424) are so written by modern editors. Most MSS. have *σός*, *σῶ*. In the former place we learn that Ar. doubted between *σαῶς* and *σοῶς* (or *σός*, for the accent here is conjectural). The ancient grammarians apparently took both forms as Opt. (which suits the sense, § 304. a). Some wrote *σαῶς*, *σαῶ* (or *σοῶς*, *σοῶ*), deriving them directly from *σαῶω*: others *σός*, *σῶ*, from *σῶω* or *σῶω*. It is not difficult to restore the uncontracted *σαῶοις*, *σαῶοι*, or, if the Subj. is preferred, *σαῶης*, *σαῶη* (so Nauck).

For the 3 Plur. in -οι-ν Bekker finds one instance of -οι-ν, viz. in Od. 20. 382, where the common text has—

*τοὺς ξείνους ἐν νηὶ πολυκλήϊδι βαλόντες
ἐς Σικέλουσ πέμψωμεν ὅθεν κέ τοι ἄξιον ἄλφοι,*

for which he would read *ἄλφοιν*. The 1 Sing. in -οι-ν (instead of the anomalous -οι-μι) was not unknown in Attic (Bekker, *H. B.* p. 111 ff)*.

παρα-φθα-ίη-σι (Il. 10. 346), with Primary instead of Secondary Ending, is perhaps a pseudo-archaic form, made on the analogy of the Subjunctives in -ησ-.

The Verbal Nouns.

84.] Infinitives and Participles are not properly speaking Verbs—since they do not contain a Subject and Predicate—but Nouns: the Infinitive is a kind of Substantive and the Participle an Adjective. In certain respects however they belong to the scheme of the Verb:—

1. They answer in form and meaning to the Tense Stems; each Tense Stem has in general an Infinitive and a Participle formed from it.
2. They are distinguished as Active and Middle (or Passive) in sense.
3. They are construed with the same oblique cases of Nouns, and the same Adverbs and Adverbial phrases, as the corresponding Verbs.

* It must not be supposed, however, that the 1 Sing. and the 3 Plur. in -οι-ν are *primitive* forms. The termination -οι-ν was originally impossible in Greek (as -em and -om are in Sanscrit); we should expect -οιᾶ, -οιᾶν (Sanscrit. -eyam, -eyus). Hence -οι-μι probably made its way into Greek in place of *οιᾶ, as -σαι-μι in the Aor. in place of -σαιᾶ (see Brugmann, in *Curt. Stud.* ix. 313). The 3 Plur. form *ἀπορίνοιν* is found in the Eleian dialect.

85.] The Infinitive Active is formed—

(1) In Non-Thematic Tenses (except the Aor. in -σα) by the Suffixes -μεναι, -μεν, -εναι, -ναι.

Of these -μεναι is the most usual, as θέ-μεναι, γνώ-μεναι, μιγή-μεναι, ἰδ-μεναι, τεθνά-μεναι, ζευγ-νύ-μεναι : -μεν occurs after short vowels, as ἵ-μεν, δό-μεν, τεθνά-μεν, ὄρ-νύ-μεν ; also in ἔμμεν (five times, but always where we may write ἔμμεν'), ἰδ-μεν (Il. 11. 719), and ζευγ-νύ-μεν (Il. 16. 145), in which the long υ is irregular.

The full Suffix -έναι only occurs in ἰ-έναι ; but there are many other Infinitives in -ναι, all of them containing a long vowel or diphthong in which an ε may be supposed to have been absorbed ; as δοῦναι (for δο-έναι, see Max Müller, *Chips*, iv. 56), θεῖναι, στήναι, βῆναι, δύναι, γνῶναι, ἀλῶναι, βιῶναι, ἀήναι, φορῆ-ναι, διδοῦναι (Il. 24. 425). The original form of the Suffix seems to have been -fέναι.

From εἰμί (ἴσ-) are formed ἔμμεναι, ἔμμεν, ἔμεναι, ἔμεν, and εἶναι. Of these ἔμεναι, ἔμεν are irregular ; they follow the analogy of θέμεναι, &c. Cp. the 1 Plur. ἐμέν (Soph. El. 21). From εἶ-μι are formed ἵ-μεναι, ἵ-μεν, and ἰ-έναι. In one place (Il. 20. 365) ἵμεναι is scanned with ι—perhaps in imitation of ἔμμεναι (Solmsen, *K. Z.* xxix. 72).

The common Attic Present Infinitives ἰσά-ναι, τιθέ-ναι, διδύ-ναι, δεικ-νύ-ναι, &c., as well as the Perfect Infinitives in -έναι, are entirely unknown in Homer.

(2) In Thematic Tenses by -έ-μεναι, -έ-μεν, -ειν ; as εἰπ-έ-μεναι, εἰπ-έ-μεν, βάλλ-ειν.

The Ending -ε-ειν only occurs in the Thematic Aor., and is anomalous ; compare βαλ-έ-ειν (Stem βαλε-) and βάλλ-ειν (Stem βαλλε-). The original ending was doubtless -έεν : thus—

Stem βαλε-, Inf. βαλέ-εν, contr. βαλεῖν.

βάλλε-, „ βάλλε-εν, „ βάλλειν.

In the Aor. the metre usually allows us to restore -έεν (see Renner, *Curt. Stud.* i. 2. p. 33).

It is possible that the forms βαλέ-ειν, &c., are genuine, since -εεν might pass into -ειν from the analogy of the Pres. Inf. in -ειν, just as in the Rhodian dialect -έμεν became -έμειν. Leo Meyer (*Vergl. Gr.* ii. 284) proposed to read βαλέ-μεν, &c. But, as Renner points out (*l. c.*), the change from -εεν to -ειν is very much slighter, indeed is a mere matter of spelling. Original βαλέμεν, &c. would probably have been retained.

(3) The Aor. in -σα forms -σαι, as στή-σαι.

(4) The Inf. Middle is formed by -σθαι : βλή-σθαι, πεφά-σθαι, ἵστα-σθαι, ἰδέ-σθαι, βάλλε-σθαι, στή-σα-σθαι.

The Infinitive is originally a Case-form of an abstract Noun (*nomen actionis*). Thus -μεναι consists of the Nominal Suffix -μεν (§ 114) with the Dative ending -αι : ἰδ-μεν-αι 'for knowing'

(Sanscr. *vid-mān-e*). Similarly *δοῦναι* is *δο-ῑεν-αι* (*dā-vān-e*) 'for giving.' Probably the Infinitives in *-σαι* and *-σθαι* also are Datives (Max Müller, *l.c.*). Infinitives in *-μεν* and *-εν* appear to be Locatives formed without Case-ending (§ 99). If so, the Infinitives in *-μεν* and *-εν* (*-ειν*) originally differed in meaning from those in *-μεναι*, *-εναι*, &c. In Greek, however, the sense of the Inf. as a Case-form is lost, so that the different forms are all construed in exactly the same way.

86.] The Participle. The Aorist, the Present, and the Future Tense Stems form the Active Participle by the Suffix *-ντ*: thus we have, Non-Thematic *στα-ντ*-, *τιθε-ντ*-; Thematic *βαλο-ντ*-, *στη-σο-ντ*-, &c.

The vowel before *ντ* is always short, as *γνο-ντ*-, *μιγε-ντ*-.

The Perfect Stem takes *-σι* or *-σσ* (originally *-For*-, *-Fos*), Fem. *-υῖα* (for *-υσι-ῖα*, the *-ῖσ* originally a weak form for *-Fos*). The Middle Participle is formed by *-μενος*, which in the Perfect is accented *-μένος*.

For the Verbal Adjectives in *-τος*-, see § 114. The Verbal in *-τέος* is post-Homeric.

CHAPTER IV.

ACCENTUATION OF THE VERB.

87.] The general rule is that the accent is thrown back as far as possible; and the chief departures from this rule are found in the Infinitives and Participles, which are in reality Nouns. In the forms of the Verb properly so called the following exceptions have to be noted:—

1. *εἰμί* and *φημί*. The 2 Sing. Imper. *φα-θί* is oxytone.

The disyllabic forms of the Pres. Indicative, *εἰμί*, *ἐσσί*, *φημί*, *φησί*, &c., are enclitic, and, when they do not lose the accent altogether, are oxytone; but *ἐσσι* is accented in the ordinary way when it occurs at the beginning of a sentence, or after certain words (*οὐκ*, *καί*, *ὥς*).

Such was the commonly accepted account; but the ancient grammarians were not agreed as to the enclitic character of the Dual and Plural forms (on *ἐστόν* see Charax 1151; on *φαμέν*, *φατέ*, *φασί*, *ibid.*; on *ἐσμέν*, *ἐστέ*, *εἰσί*, Eust. 1457, 48). Again, one grammarian denies that *φημί* was ever enclitic (Charax 1152); another holds that it should be written *φῆμι*, at least in such instances as *φῆμι γὰρ οὖν κατανεύσαι*, κτλ. (Tyrannio ap. Eust. 1613, 18). In all likelihood the original forms were, Sing. *ἔστι*, *φῆμι*, Plur. *ἐσμέν*, *φαμέν*, and we may suppose that *φημί* and *ἐστί* are not properly oxytone, but are unaccented forms made oxytone as enclitics (*ὠξύνθη διὰ τὴν ἐποῦσαν αὐτοῖς*

ἐγκλινῶν Apoll. Synt.). The Sanscrit Verbs of the same kind follow the rule of accenting the Stem in the Sing., the Ending in the Dual and Plur.; and this must be connected with the difference of quantity between strong and weak Stems (§ 6). See Benfey, *Vedica und Linguistica*, pp. 90 ff.

The 2 Sing. εἰς is enclitic, though the corresponding Attic form εἶ is not; but see § 5. As to φῆς there is a contradiction; it is not enclitic according to Arc. 142, 8, but enclitic according to Schol. A. II. 17. 147—both notices being supposed to rest on the authority of Herodian (ed. Lentz, i. 553, 4 and ii. 105, 5).

2. The 3 Plur. ἰσᾶσι, τιθεῖσι, διδοῦσι, δεικνῦσι, are properispomena (Herodian, i. 459, ed. Lentz).

This can hardly have been the original accentuation, since they are not contracted forms, but represent ἴστα-ντι, &c. Probably it comes from the Attic ἰσᾶσι (contracted from ἰσά-σαι, cp. τιθέ-σαι, &c.). The Doric forms are written τιθέντι, &c. by Eustath. Od. 1557, 45; but we do not know that this represents the usage of any living dialect.

3. Subjunctives such as φανῇ, δαῶμεν are circumflexed, as being contracted forms (for φανῆη, δαήομεν). On εἰδέω, εἰδῆς, εἰδῆ, εἰδέωσι see § 80.

Optatives in which -ιη- becomes -ι- before Heavy Endings are accented on the ι throughout, as διακρινθῆιτε, δαμείεν.

But Middle forms to which there is no corresponding Active follow the general rule: δύνωμαι, δύνῃαι (so Herodian, but Tyrannio wrote δυνῶμαι, δυνῆαι, Schol. II. 6. 229), κέρωνται (II. 4. 260), ἐπίσθηται (§ 280); ἐπίσταιτο, ὄναιο, ὄνοιτο.

4. The Imperatives εἰπέ, ἐλθέ, are oxytone (and so in Attic εὐρέ, ἰδέ, λαβέ). Similarly Tyrannio wrote πιθέσθε, λαβέσθε (Schol. V. II. 18. 266); cp. the Attic βαλοῦ, &c.

The rule in Sanscrit is that the Verb loses the accent, except in subordinate clauses, or when it begins the sentence. Hence the verbs εἰμί and φημί in fact retain the original accentuation, which was doubtless that of the Indo-European language. The Imperatives εἰπέ, ἐλθέ, &c., are evidently words that would often be used to begin a sentence.

The ordinary accent of a Greek verb, the so-called 'recessive' accent, represents the original enclitic condition. The Opt. φαίην, for example, is originally oxytone. On the Sanscrit rules it loses its accent, and we should have (e.g.) ἐγώ-φαην. But owing to the Greek rhythmical law this is impossible. Accordingly the accent goes back as far as the Greek rules will allow, and we have ἐγώ-φαίην.

5. The final -αι of the Endings -μαι, -σαι, -ται, -νται, and of the Inf. is treated as short. These are all cases in which -αι represents the original *final* sound of the word. But the -αι of the Opt., which is for original -αιτ, counts as long.

88.] Accent in Composition. Unaugmented forms of Compound Verbs are accented as though the Verb were an enclitic

following the Preposition: hence σύν-εχον, πρό-ες, παρά-θες, περί-κειται, ἀπό-σχωνται. If the final syllable of the Preposition is lost by elision or apocope the accent falls on the first syllable; hence ὕφ-ελλε, κάτ-θανε.

But the accent falls if possible upon the Augment: hence προσ-έβαν, ἐπ-έσχον, ἐπ-ῆλθε. In other words, the Augment is treated in accentuation as a *Preposition*.

The form ἔσται keeps the accent (παρ-έσται, &c.); perhaps because it is formed by syncope from ἔσεται.

The Subj. ξυμ-βληται (Od. 7. 204) ought to be properisponenon, if it is a contracted form; cp. βλήεται (Od. 17. 472). The grammarians however wrote ἀπό-θωμαι (in spite of ἀπο-θείομαι, Il. 18. 409) and διά-θωμαι (Herodian, i. 469, 7, ed. Lentz). We have to recognise in such cases the encroachment of the common Thematic type, though we may doubt whether the change reaches back to the earliest form of the text of Homer.

According to Herodian, the 2 Sing. Imperative ἐνί-σπες is paroxytone, but the other Imperative form ἐνι-σπε, and the Indic. forms ἐνι-σπε-s, ἐνισπε, are proparoxytone; see Schol. on Il. 24. 388. That is to say, the Imper. ἐνί-σπε-s is regular, the others are accented as if compounds of ἰσπω.

The Imperative ἐπισχε in Hes. Scut. 446 may be divided ἐπ-ισχε or ἐπι-σχε, and in the latter case we may write ἐπίσχε (with the MSS.), or ἐπισχε, like the ἐνισπε of Herodian.

The MSS. vary between (Imper.) ἐνίσπες and ἐνισπε: in the two places of the Iliad (11. 186., 14. 470) the Venetus has ἐνίσπες: on the other hand in the only Homeric passage in which the metre gives any help (Od. 4. 642) it is decisive for ἐνισπε. The accent in the MSS. nearly always follows Herodian's rule.

89.] The Infinitive and Participle. Infinitives in -ειν and -μεναι follow the general rule: those in -μεν have the same accent as the corresponding forms in -μεναι, as φεγγέ-μεν. On the Aor. Inf. in -εῖν, see § 85, 2.

The forms in -ναι, -σαι accent the penultimate, as λέναι, ἀλῶναι, ἐρύσαι. The Middle forms of the Thematic Aorist and Perfect are also paroxytone, as πιθέσθαι, λελαθέσθαι, κεκλήσθαι, τετύχθαι. The ancient grammarians doubted between ἀκάχησθαι, ἀλάλησθαι and ἀκαχῆσθαι, ἀλαλήσθαι. The former were adopted in the common texts, and were explained as Æolic forms of the Pres. Infinitive (Herodian, ii. 111, 21, ed. Lentz).

It may be conjectured that the forms in -μεναι and -μεν were originally accented on the suffix, like Sanscr. *vidmāne*, *dāvāne*. If so, this is one of the cases in which the accent of an archaic form in Homer has been lost.

Active Participles, except the Thematic Present and Future, accent the Suffix, as διδούς, στρεφθείς, μεμαώς, λαβών, τεταγών. So the Presents ἔων, ἰών.

The Part. of the Pf. Middle is paroxytone. But ἀκαχήμενος follows ἀκάχησθαι.

In Composition the Infinitive and Participle retain the accent of the simple word; in other words, they do not become enclitic. Hence we have Impf. σύν-εχον, but Neut. Part. συν-έχον.

CHAPTER V.

NOUNS AND PRONOUNS.

90.] The words to which we now proceed are incapable of forming Sentences except in combination with a Verb.

The relation of such words to the Verb is shown in general either by a *Case-Ending*—as in the words which are said to be ‘declined,’—or by an *Adverbial Ending* (such as -ως, -θεν, &c.). The Ending in either case is suffixed to a *Stem* or *Theme*. Thus, λογο- is the Stem of the Case-forms, Nom. λόγο-ς, Acc. λόγο-ν, Gen. λόγο-ιο, &c.: αὐτο- is the Stem of the Case-forms αὐτό-ς, αὐτό-ν, αὐτο-ιο, and also of the Adverbs αὐτό-θεν, αὐτό-θι, αὐτως, &c.

The Stems now in question belong to two great classes, those of *Nouns* and of *Pronouns*, called *Nominal* and *Pronominal* Stems respectively. The term ‘Noun’ includes Substantives and Adjectives. The other ‘parts of speech’—Adverbs, Prepositions, Conjunctions—may ultimately be resolved into Case-forms or Adverbial forms either of Nouns or Pronouns.

The distinction between Nouns and Pronouns brings before us in a new form the fundamental antithesis involved in the division of a Verb into a Stem which ‘predicates,’ and a Person-Ending which marks the Subject. A Noun either denotes a single object or group of objects (*i.e.* when it is a ‘proper name’), or denotes objects through their permanent attributes, as belonging to a class; whereas a Pronoun denotes an object by its local position, or momentary relation to something else, as ‘this’ or ‘that,’ ‘here’ or ‘there,’ ‘same’ or ‘other.’ This contrast is shortly expressed by saying that Nominal Stems are *Predicative*, and Pronominal Stems *Demonstrative*; the former name or describe, the latter only ‘point out’ what is intended. Accordingly, Nominal Stems are in general either identical with, or formed from, the Stems of Verbs: Pronouns are found to contain the same elements as those which furnish the Person-Endings of Verbs. The simplest forms obtained by analysis are thus of two kinds. They were first clearly distinguished by Bopp, and called by him *Verbal* and *Pronominal Roots* respectively (*Vergl.-Gr.* § 105).

The Cases.

91.] **Declensions.** The main distinction is that between the *Consonantal Declension* (including that of Stems in -ι and -υ),

which forms the Genitive in -ος, and the *Vowel Declensions*, of which three may be distinguished:—

- (1) Stems in -ο (chiefly Masc. and Neut.): Gen. -οιο.
 (2) „ -ᾱ, -η (chiefly Fem.): Gen. -ας, -ης.
 (3) „ -ε (Personal Pronouns): Gen. -ειο.

92.] Vocative. A Noun used in addressing a person by his name or title has properly no Case-Ending. Accordingly the Vocative Case consists in general of the simple Stem; e.g. Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, Αἴαν (for Αἴαντ-), διόγενης, ὦ ἄνα (for ἀνακτ-).

In Il. 1. 86 Κάλχαν (Voc. of Κάλχας) was read by Aristarchus, Κάλχα by Zenodotus. On the other hand in Il. 12. 231 Ar. read Πουλυδάμα, but Zen. Πουλυδάμαν. The form Λαοδάμα in Od. 8. 141 probably has the authority of Aristarchus.

Stems in -ο form the Voc. in -ε, as φίλε ἔκυρέ. Some Stems in -ᾱ(η) shorten the final vowel, as νύμφᾱ, Voc. of νύμφη, and the Masc. συβῶτᾱ, ἡπεροπεντᾱ, τοξότᾱ, κυνῶπᾱ, &c. But the long vowel of the Stem is used in the Voc. Ἑρμείᾱ, Ἀγρεῖδῃ, ὕψαγόρῃ, αἰναρέτῃ (Il. 16. 31). Feminines in -ω or -φ form the Voc. in -οι, as Αἰητοῖ (Il. 21. 498). Evidently -φ: -οι :: η: ᾱ.

The words of address, πάππα, ἄττα, τέττα, μᾶῖα, may be ranked as Vocatives. So ἡθεῖε, as to which see the note on § 96.

93.] Case-Endings. These are given in the following Table. The Endings of the Consonantal Declension are in larger type: the two Vowel Declensions of Nouns are numbered (1), (2), and the Pronominal Declension (3).

	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Dual.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Nom.	-ς	-ε	-ες, Neut. -ᾶ
	(1) -ο-s, Neut. -ο-ν	-ω	-οι
	(2) -ᾱ(η), -ιᾱ; -η-s	-ᾱ	-αι
Acc.	-ν, -ᾶ	-ε	-ᾶς, Neut. -ᾶ
		(1) -ω	-ους (for -ο-νς)
		(2) -ᾱ	-ᾶς (-α-νς)
Gen.	-ος	-οῖιν	-ων
	(1) -οιο, -οο, -ον	-οῖιν	-ων
	(2) -ης; -ᾱο, -εω	—	-ᾶων, -εων
	(3) -ειο, -εο, -εν	-ι(ν)	-εἰων, -εων
Dat.	-ι	-οῖιν	-σι(ν), -εσσσι(ν)
	(1) -φ (Loc. -οι)	-οῖιν	-οισι(ν), -οις
	(2) -ῃ (Loc. -αι ?)	—	-ῃσι(ν), -ῃς
	(3) -οι	-ι(ν)	-ιιν, -ιιν
Instrum.	-φι(ν)		-φι(ν)

94.] **Stems ending in ι, υ, and σ** are liable to lose the final letter before the Case-Endings which begin with a vowel.

1. Stems in -ηυ, -ευ : e. g.—

νηύ-s, Gen. νη-ός (for νη^F-ός), rarely νε-ός. The ε arises by shortening from η ; so νέες, νεών, νέεσσι, νέας—all less common than the corresponding forms with η-, νῆες, νηών, νήεσσι, νῆας.

The forms νηύ-s, νηυ-σί are irregular, since original *āu* before a consonant would appear in Greek as *āu* (cp. Ζεύς for original *dyēus*). Hence the true Greek form is preserved in the Instrum. ναῦ-φιν (§ 104) and the Compounds ναυσι-κλυτός, Ναυσι-κάα, &c. The η of νηύ-s and νηυ-σί is taken by analogy from the other Cases.

βασιλεύ-s, Gen. βασιλῆ-ος (but Dat. Plur. βασιλεῦ-σι).

Πηλεύ-s, Gen. Πηλῆ-ος and Πηλέ-ος. In oblique Cases of Stems in -ευ the ε seems to be nearly confined to proper names ; cp. Τυδέος Τυδέϊ Τυδέα, Ἀγρέος Ἀγρέϊ, Θησεά, Νηλέα, &c.

On Ζεύς, βοῦς see § 106, 2.

2. Stems in -ι and -υ form the same Cases in two ways :—

(1) Retaining the Stem-vowel, as κόνι-s κόνι-ος, Πάρι-s Πάρι-ος, ἰλῦς ἰλῦ-ος, ἰχθύ-s ἰχθύ-ες, σῶ-s συ-ός, συ-ί, σύ-ες.

It is probable that this form of declension was originally confined to monosyllables.

(2) Inserting ε and dropping ι or υ : as πόσι-s, Dat. πόσε-ϊ, ἄστν ἄστε-ος, πῆχυν-s πῆχε-ος, πολύ-s πολέ-ος. Here the Stem of the oblique Cases ends in -ει, -ευ : hence Gen. -εος for -ει-ος, -εφ-ος, &c.

πόλις forms several of its Cases in three ways :

(1) Gen. πόλι-ος, Dat. πόλῃ (for πόλι-ι, § 99), Plur. Nom. πόλι-ες, Gen. πολί-ων, Dat. πολί-εσσι, Acc. πόλι-ας and πόλῃς (§ 100).

(2) Gen. πόλεος (so Bekk. reads in Il. 2. 811., 21. 567, with the scanning υ — ; cp. πόλεως in Theognis), Dat. πόλει, πτόλει (Il. 17. 152, perhaps should be πτόλυ, cp. the Cyprian form πτολιγι).

(3) Gen. πόλη-ος, Dat. πόλῃ-ϊ, Plur. Nom. πόλη-ες, Acc. πόλη-ας.

The stem πολη- which furnishes the last of these three forms of inflexion has been traced by Joh. Schmidt (*K. Z.* xxvii. p. 287) to a primitive Locative in -η (cp. Sanscr. *agni*, Loc. *agnā*), to which the ordinary Loc. -ι was suffixed. From this new Loc. πόλη-ι the other Cases were then formed by analogy.

The Nouns in -ᾱ (from -ιᾱ) answer to the original Stems in -ι, as ἰδυῖα, for ἰδυσ-ια, Sanscr. *vidush-ī*.

ἡύ-s or ἑύ-s good makes Gen. ἑή-ος, perhaps by transference of quantity for ἡέ-ος. Other Adjectives in -ύς form -έ-ος, -έ-ι, &c.

3. Stems in -εσ, -ασ, -οσ drop the σ, as ἔπε-ος, κέρα-ος, αἰδό-ος.

95.] **Original** \bar{a} as the final vowel of the Stem becomes η ; except (1) after ϵ , $\epsilon\iota$, $\bar{\alpha}$, as in $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$, and the proper names $\epsilon\rho\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, $\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, $\alpha\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, $\nu\alpha\nu\sigma\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}\alpha$, $\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (Ar. on Il. 14. 203), $\Phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (Il. 7. 135, Od. 15. 297), and (2) in the Gen. in $-\bar{\alpha}o$ and $-\bar{\alpha}ων$.

Other exceptions to the scheme given above will be best treated under the separate Cases.

96.] **Nominative Singular.** The final $-s$ is retained after vowels and mutes, but lost with Stems ending in ρ , as $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, $\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\tau\omega\rho$.

Stems ending in ν either (1) take final $-s$ (with loss of ν), as $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (for $\acute{\epsilon}\nu-s$), $\theta\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ Acc. $\theta\acute{\iota}\nu-a$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$ Gen. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\nu-os$, or (2) do not take $-s$, but lengthen a preceding vowel, as $\chi\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$ Gen. $\chi\thetaον-ός$, $\piοιμ\acute{\eta}\nu$ Gen. $\piοιμ\acute{\epsilon}\nu-os$. So with Stems in $-\nu\tau$: $\deltaο\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ Gen. $\deltaόντ-os$, but $\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$. Originally it seems that all monosyllables took $-s$ and all others $-\nu$ (J. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxvii. 392). If so, $\chi\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\phi\rho\acute{\eta}\nu$, &c. are forms due to the $-\nu$ of the oblique Cases: and on the other hand $\delta\acute{\iota}\deltaο\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, &c. have followed the analogy of corresponding monosyllabic words, $\deltaο\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, &c.

There is a remarkable group of Masc. Stems in $-\bar{\alpha}(\eta)$, with Nom. Sing. in $-\bar{\alpha}$, viz.—

Titles of gods: $\nu\epsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\eta\gamma\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha$, $\sigma\tau\epsilon\rhoο\pi\eta\gamma\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha$, $\mu\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\alpha$, $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\pi\alpha$ ($\text{Ze}\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$); $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\tau\alpha$ ($\epsilon\rho\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \acute{\alpha}$); $\kappa\upsilon\alpha\nuο\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha$ (Ποσειδάων).

Titles of heroes: $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\eta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha$, $\alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}$; $\acute{\eta}\pi\acute{\upsilon}\tau\alpha$ ($\kappa\acute{\eta}\rho\upsilon\varsigma$).

One proper name, $\Theta\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha$ (Il. 2. 107).

Except $\Theta\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha$ these words are only found as adjectives: thus we have $\alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\Lambda\upsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$, $\kappa\upsilon\alpha\nuο\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha$ Ποσειδάων , but $\alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, $\kappa\upsilon\alpha\nuο\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma$ when the same words are substantives.

The accent generally follows the forms in $-\eta-s$ where such forms exist; thus $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$, $\alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}$, like $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\eta\varsigma$, $\alpha\acute{\iota}\chi\mu\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$. But it is thrown back in $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\pi\alpha$, $\mu\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\tau\alpha$,—ancient epithets only known from the traditional Homeric use.

These are in reality Vocatives which have been turned into Nominatives. That is to say, they belonged originally to certain established forms of address— $\mu\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\alpha$ $\text{Ze}\acute{\upsilon}$, $\kappa\upsilon\alpha\nuο\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha$ Ποσειδάων , $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha$ $\text{Πηλε}\acute{\upsilon}$, &c.—and were not inflected when the names to which they were attached came to be used in the Nom. In this way the *rhythm*, which doubtless had a traditional sacredness, remained unaltered, and the whole phrase retained something of its vocative character. The feeling which might lead to this is that expressed by Eumæus in Od. 14. 145 ff.—

$\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu, \bar{\omega} \xi\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon, \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} ο\acute{\upsilon} \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau' \delta\rhoομ\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$
 $\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\rho\alpha\iota \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \mu' \acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\iota \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa\acute{\eta}\delta\epsilon\tauο \theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\omega}$
 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \mu\upsilon\iota \acute{\eta}\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \nu\acute{\omicron}\sigma\phi\iota\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha.$

I call him by the title $\acute{\eta}\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ even in his absence,—the word $\acute{\eta}\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ being only used as a form of address. Cp. also § 111 (2). The Nominatives in $-\bar{\alpha}$ are evidently part of the archaic and conventional style of Epic poetry. They are commoner in the Iliad than in the Odyssey in the proportion of 3 to 1. The ancient grammarians regarded them as *Æolic*, but without sufficient reason.

The form *εὐρύσπα* also appears as an Acc., and has accordingly been explained from a Nom. *εὐρύ-σψ*. It is improbable however that it is a different word from the Nom. Voc. *εὐρύσπα*. Probably the fact that it had the appearance of an Acc. of one of the numerous Compounds in *-σψ* led to an extension of use*.

97.] Accusative Sing. The Ending *-ᾱ* is found after consonants and the diphthongs *ηυ*, *ευ*; as *νηῦ-ς νῆα* (for *νηα*, *νηfa*), *βασιλεύ-ς βασιλῆα*, *Τυδεύ-ς Τυδέα* †. Otherwise the Acc. takes *-ν*; e. g. *πόλι-ν*, *ἰχθύ-ν*, *βοῦ-ν*.

But *εὐρύ-ς* makes *εὔρεα* in the phrases *εὔρεα πόντον*, *εὔρεα κόλπον*: the common form being *εὐρύ-ν*.

The original Ending is *-m*, which becomes *-ν* after a vowel and *-ᾱ* (for *η*) after a consonant. The preference for *ᾱ* after *ηυ*, *ευ* is due to the semi-consonantal nature of the *υ* in these combinations. We may compare the Aorists *ἔκηα* (for *ἐκηυ-α*), *ἔχενα* (also *ἔχεα*), &c., and on the other hand *ἔδυν*, *ἔφυν*.

Several Stems form the Acc. in *-ν* and also in *-ιδα*: *ἔριδα* and *ἔριν* (Od.), *φυλόπιδα* (Od. II. 313) and *φύλοπιν*, *γλαυκώπιδα* (Il. 8. 373) and *γλαυκῶπιν* (Od. I. 156), *ἀνάκιδα* and *ἀνακιν* (Od. 3. 375), *ὄπιδα* and *ὄπιν*, *Κύπριδα* and *Κύπριν*; *θοῦριν*, *Ἴριν*, *αἴλιν*, *Θέτιν*. Cp. also *χάρι-ν* (for *χάριτ-α*), and *κόρυ-ν* (for *κόρυθ-α*), found in the line Il. 13. 131 (= 16. 215),—

ἀσπίς ἄρ' ἀσπιδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυν, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνῆρ.

In Attic there are many more such forms; *ὄρυν*, &c.

Note that no oxytones form the Acc. in *-ν*.

The Accusatives *ζαῆν* (Od. 12. 313), **Ἀρην*, *Μέγην* are probably formed directly from the Nom. *Ζαῆς*, **Ἀρης*, *Μέγης*, on the analogy of Masc. Nouns in *-ης*. On the other hand *Ζῆν* (*Zeús*), *βῶν* (*boús*), are very ancient forms, answering to the Sanscr. *dyám*, *gám* (Joh. Schmidt in *K. Z.* xxv. 17): see § 106, 2.

A final *δ* is lost in the Neut. Pronouns *δ*, *τό*, *τοῦτο*, *ἐκεῖνο*, *ἄλλο* (Lat. *id*, *is-tud*, *illud*, *aliud*), and in *τί* (Lat. *quid*): perhaps also in the Personal Pronouns, Acc. Sing. *ἐμέ* (*με*), *σέ*, *ξ*, Dual *νώ*, *σφώ*, *σφῶε*, Plur. *ἄμμε*, *ὑμμε*, *σφέ* (*Curt. Stud.* vi. 417 ff.; Max Müller, *Chips*, iv. 44).

* It will be shown hereafter (§ 116, 2) that the Masc. Nouns in *-ης* are probably derived from Feminines in *-τη*, of abstract or collective meaning. Hence it is possible that the Homeric Nominatives in *-ᾱ* come directly from these Feminines: so that (e.g.) *μητέρα* meant literally Counsel rather than Counsellor. The abstract word may have been used as a title, like *βίη Πριάμοιο* and the like. According to Joh. Schmidt (*Pluralb.* p. 400) *εὐρύσπα* is originally a Neuter: see § 107, 2.

† The forms *Τυδῆ* (Il. 4. 348) and *Μηκιστῆ* (Il. 15. 339) are probably false: see Nauck, *Mél. gr.-rom.* iii. 222.

98.] Genitive Singular. The Stems in -ο form the Gen. in -οιο, -οο, -ου. Of these forms only -οιο and -ου are read in the existing text of Homer; but there are sufficient traces of -οο, and indeed several places where it is called for by the metre. Thus we must read—

- Il. 2. 518 νίέες Ἰφίτοο μεγαθύμου.
 15. 66 (= 21. 104) Ἰλίοο προπάροιθεν.
 22. 313 ἀγρίοο, πρόσθεν δὲ κτλ.
 Od. 10. 36 δῶρα παρ' Αἰόλοο μεγαλήτορος.
 60 βῆν εἰς Αἰόλοο κλυτὰ δῶματα.
 Il. 9. 440, &c. ὁμοίτοο πτολέμοιο (for ὁμοίτον πτολέμοιο).
 2. 325 δο κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται } (for δον).
 Od. 1. 70 δο κράτος ἔσκε μέγιστον }
 Il. 2. 731 Ἀσκληπίοο δύο παῖδε.
 15. 554 ἀνψιόο καταμένοιο.
 5. 21 ἀδελφεόο καταμένοιο: so in—
 6. 61 (= 7. 120., 13. 788) ἀδελφεόο φρένας ἦρως.
 Od. 14. 239 χαλεπὴ δ' ἔχε δήμοο φήμις.

Also in the two lines—

- Il. 6. 344 εἵνεκ' ἐμείο κυνὸς κακομηχάνου ὀκρυόεσσης,
 9. 723 δς πολέμου ἔραται ἐπιδημίου ὀκρυέντος,
 since ὀκρυέεις does not occur elsewhere, but κρυόεσσα (Il. 5. 740),
 κρηόεντος (Il. 9. 2), κρυερὸς &c., we should probably read—

... κακομηχάνου κρυόεσσης.
 ... ἐπιδημίου κρυέντος.

A trace of -οο may also be found in the fact that Nouns in -ας sometimes form the Gen. in -εω, which is for -αοο; e.g. Πιετέ-ω, Πηνελέ-ω.

Masc. Stems in -ᾱ(η) form the Gen. in -ᾱο (original -ᾱσιο), less commonly -εω (by transference of quantity). This -εω is often scanned as one syllable; after another vowel it is written -ω, as Βορέ-ω (for Βορέ-εω), Ἑρμεί-ω, Αἰνεί-ω, ἔϋμμελί-ω. (So in Ionic, *Curt. Stud.* v. 294., viii. 172.)

The Pronominal Stems in -ε, viz. ἐμε (με), σε (for τε), and ἐ or ἐε, form the Gen. in -ειο, -εο and (by contraction) -ευ. Thus we find ἐμείο, ἐμέο (Il. 10. 124), ἐμεῦ; σείο, σέο, σεῦ; εἰο, ξο, εῦ. For σείο there is also a longer form τεοῖο (Il. 8. 37=468), and for ξο in one place (Il. 19. 384) Zenodotus read εῶδ.

99.] Dative Singular. In Homer the ι of the Dat. is sometimes long (as in Latin), chiefly in forms which otherwise could not be easily brought into the verse; in the Iliad, Ἀχιλλῆϊ, ὑπερμένει, κράτει, σάκεϊ, πτόλει, σθένει, ἔριδι; in the Odyssey, Ὀδυσσῆϊ, ἔτει, δέπαϊ, ὕδατι. But we find also Ζηνὶ μενεαίνομεν (Il. 15. 104), παρ νηὶ τε μένειν (Od.) See § 373.

The Dat. of Neuters in *-as* was commonly written *-a*; but the long *α* is anomalous, and *-αι* is now read by La Roche from good MSS. (in *σέλαι, κέραι*). The forms in *-a* appear to have become established in later Greek (Hdn. II, 316, 10, ed. Lentz).

Stems in *-ι*, Gen. *-ι-ος*, form the Dat. in *-ι*, as *κόνι, μήτι, μάστι, κνήστι, Θέτι, νεμέσσι* (with v. l. *νεμέσσει* Il. 6. 335). So Bekker restored the forms *πόλι* (Il. 5. 686, &c.), *ἀγύρι* (Il. 16. 661), *ᾠψι, ὕβρι, δυνάμι, πόσι*, for which the common texts give forms in *-ει*.

Stems in *-υ*, Gen. *-υ-ος*, form the Dat. in *-υι* (a diphthong which in later Greek can only occur before a vowel), *πληθυῖ* (Il. 22. 458), *νέκυι, δρχηστυῖ, οἰζυῖ, ἰξυῖ, θρήνυι*. But *δρυ-ς, σῦ-ς* form the disyllables *δρυ-ι, συ-ι*.

It is possible, however, that the Datives in *-ι* are Instrumental forms, and similarly that the Datives in *-υι* have taken the place of Instrumentals in *-ο*. For the Vedic and Zend Instrum. in *-ι, -υ* see Osthoff, *M. U.* ii. 139.

Sanscrit Nouns in *-an* and *-as* sometimes form the Locative from the Stem without any Case-ending (Whitney, 425, c). Traces of this are to be found in Greek in the form *αἰν* (cp. *αἰεί*), and the Inf. in *-μεν* and *-εν* (§ 85).

Stems in *-ο* sometimes form a Locative in *-οι*, as well as the true Dat. in *-ω*, e. g. *οἴκο-ι*. So *χαμα-ί* and perhaps *πάλα-ι*. Cp. the adverbial ending *-ει* (§ 110).

Pronominal Stems in *-ε* form *-οι*; *ἐμοί* (enclitic *μοι*), *σοί* (encl. *τοι*), *ἐοί* and *οἶ*. For *σοί* there is another form *τεῖν* (Il. 11. 201): so in Doric we find *ἐμίν* and *ἐίν, ἱν*.

99*.] **Plural.** Several Stems in *-ο* which are Masc. (or Fem.) in the Sing. form a Neut. Plur.: *κέλευθος*, Plur. *κέλευθοι* and more commonly *κέλευθα*; *μηρός*, Plur. *μηροί* and *μήρα*; *κύκλος*, Plur. *κύκλοι* and *κύκλα*; *ἰός*, Plur. *ιοί* and *ιά*; *Τάρταρος*, Plur. *Τάρταρα* (Hes.). There is probably a slight change of meaning, the Neuter expressing vague mass or quantity rather than plurality: cp. *δρυμά* *thicket*, and post-Homeric *δεσμά, θεσμά, σῖτα*, Lat. *loca, joca*. Thus *κέλευθα* means *a group of paths*, and could not be used (e. g.) in such a passage as Il. 10. 66 *πολλὰι γὰρ ἀνὰ στρατόν εἰσι κέλευθοι*. So *κύκλα* of a set of wheels, *Τάρταρα* of one place so called, &c.

100.] **Accusative Plural.** Stems in *-ι* and *-υ* which admit an Acc. Sing. in *-ν* often form the Plur. in *-ις, -ῦς* (for *-ως, -υς*): thus *οἶς* (Il. 11. 245), *ἀκοίτις* (Od. 10. 7), *βοῦς ἦνις* (Il. 6. 94). So we should read *πόλις* (with Bekker) for *πόλεις*. Again we have *δρυς, γένυς, κλιῦς, γραπτῦς, σῦς* and *σύ-ας, ἰχθῦς* and *ἰχθύ-ας* (Od. 22. 384), *ὄφρυς* (Il. 16. 740) and *ὄφρύ-ας* (Od. 9. 389), *νέκυς* (Od. 24. 417) and *νέκυ-ας, βοῦς* and *βό-ας*.

Stems in -υ, Gen. -εος, have only -εας in Homer: except πολῦς, read by Zenodotus in Il. 2. 4, perhaps in other places (Il. 1. 559., 13. 734., 15. 66., 20. 313., 21. 59, 131, Od. 3. 262., 4. 170), where the MSS. have πολέας or πολεῖς.

The MS. of Schol. A in Il. 2. 4 gives πολεῖς as read by Zen., but the context shows that the true reading of the scholium is πολῦς. But there is no trace of this form in any of the other places.

The Personal Pronouns have ἡμέας (once ἡμας), ὑμέας, σφέας (once σφᾶς encl., Il. 5. 567), as well as ἄμμε, ὕμμε, σφέ. The forms in -ᾶς are later, the result of adding the common ending of the Acc. Plur.: see on the Acc. Sing.

101.] Genitive Plural. Stems in -ᾱ(η) and -ᾶ form the Gen. Plur. in -ᾶων, less commonly -εων. The -εων is generally scanned -ἔων, and after a vowel is written -ῶν, as κλισι-ῶν, παρει-ῶν, τρυφालει-ῶν, Σκαι-ῶν (cp. the Gen. Sing. in -ᾱο, -εω).

The Pronominal Stems ἡμε-, ὑμε-, σφε- form ἡμέων and ὑμέων, ὑμείων σφέων (encl.) and σφῶν.

These forms are plausibly explained by supposing that originally the Gen. was in -ειο, as in the Singular. Then *ἄμμεῖο, *ὕμμεῖο, were assimilated to the Gen. Plur. in -ων; and σφέων followed the same analogy later (Brugmann, *K. Z.* xxvii. 397).

102.] Dative Plural. The two Endings of the Dat. Plur. are -σι(ν) and -εσσι(ν). Many Nouns in Homer form the Case in both ways, e. g. βοῦ-σί and βό-εσσι (for βοῦ-εσσι), χερ-σί and χείρ-εσσι, ποσσί or ποσί (for ποδ-σί) and πόδ-εσσι, ἀνδρά-σι and ἀνδρ-εσσι, μνηστῆρ-σι and μνηστῆρ-εσσι. The accent is often different, the forms in -εσσι being always proparoxytone. The ending -σι(ν) originally belongs to the Locative Plur. (Sanscr. -su).

A final dental or -σ with -σι forms -σσι, and this σσ may be reduced to σ, as in ποσσί and ποσί, ἔπεσ-σι and ἔπεισι, δέπασ-σι and δέπασι. But -εσι for the ending -εσσι is very rare: χεῖρ-εσι, ἵν-εσι, αἶγ-εσι, οἷ-εσι, ἀνάκτ-εσι occur once each.

An ending -σσι (instead of -σι) occurs in a few stems in -υ (Gen. -υος): γένυ-σσι (Il. 11. 416), νέκυ-σσι (Od.), πίτυ-σσι (Od.). This is an extension of the type ἔπεσ-σι, &c.: cp. ἱρισι (Il. 13. 27) for ἱριδ-σι. Or possibly, as Brugmann suggests (*G. G.* p. 62), these are forms in -ῦσι, -ῖσι, the vowel retaining its original quantity (cp. § 116, 3 and 4).

Final ι or υ of the Stem becomes ε in ἐπάλξε-σι, πολέ-σι (πολύ-ς), from the analogy of the other Cases, as ἐπάλξε-ος, πολέ-ος. Similarly on the analogy of forms with -εσσι (as in ἔπεσσι) we have the rare forms πολ-έσσι (πολύ-ς), πελέκ-εσσι (πέλεκ-υς).

The Ending -εσσι(ν) is itself the result of a similar analogy. In ἔπεσσι, βέλεσσι, &c. the -εσσι was felt as characteristic of the

Case, and then combined with other Stems; hence *κύν-εσσι*, *σύ-εσσι*, &c. Thus forms like *ἐπέ-εσσι* (for *ἐπεσ-εσσι*) really contain the Suffix *εσ* twice over. (Bopp, *Vergl. Gr.* § 292 of the first edition; Meyer, *G. G.* p. 355.)

Stems in *-ο* and *-ᾱ* (*η*) form the Dat. Plur. in *-οισι(ν)* and *-ησι(ν)* respectively, also in *-οις* and *-αις* or *-ης*. The latter forms are common in the existing text of Homer, but (as was pointed out by Gerland, *K. Z.* ix. 36, and again by Nauck, *Mél. gr.-rom.* iii. 244) in the great majority of instances the loss of *ι* may be regarded as due to elision: *e.g.* for *σοῖς ἐτάροισι* we may write *σοῖς' ἐτάροισι*. The Fem. *-αις* appears only in the forms *θεαῖς* (Od. 5. 119), *ἄκραῖς* (Il. 12. 284), and *πάσαις* (Od. 22. 471). Hence it is a question whether the forms in *-οις*, *-αις* are Homeric.

The Endings *-οισι*, *-ησι* are those of the Locative (Sanscr. *-ēshu*, *-āsu*). Originally *-ησι* was without *ι* (as in the adverbial *Ἀθήησι*, *θύρᾱσι*). The Endings *-οις*, *-αις* are probably not to be derived from *-οισι*, *-ησι*, but from the original Instrumental of Stems in *-ο*. This was in Sanscr. *-āis*, in Greek **-ωις*, becoming *-οις*: and from this again by an easy analogy the corresponding Fem. *-αις* was formed.

The Pronouns of the First and Second Person use two forms, viz. (1) *-ἔν* in *ἡμῖν* (encl. *ῆμιν*) and *ὕμῖν* (encl. *ῥμιν*), and (2) *-ἔ(ν)* in *ἄμμι(ν)*, *ῥμμι(ν)*, also *ῆμῖν*, *ὕμῖν*. This is evidently the same Suffix as in *ἐμίν*, *τείν*, *ἔίν*, and the form *-ἔν* is presumably the older (for which *-ἔν* was perhaps adopted from the analogy of the Dat. in *-σῖν*).

The 3 Plur. *σφι(ν)* is originally in all probability the Instrum. Plur. of the Stem *σφε-* (for *σφ-φιν*): cp. Lat. *sibi*, for *s-bi*. If so, the other Case-forms *σφέ*, *σφέων*, *σφι-σι* as well as the corresponding Duals *σφῶ*, &c. are the result of analogy.

103.] Dual. The Nom. Acc. in *-ᾱ*, from Stems in *ᾱ*, *η* is only found as a Masc.: *Ἀτρεΐδᾱ*, *κορυστᾱ* (Il. 18. 163), *ὠκυπέτᾱ* (Il. 8. 42): but Fem. *προφάνεντε*, *πληγέντε* (of two goddesses, Il. 8. 378, 455).

The Genitive and Dative Ending in all Nouns is *-οῖν*, as *ποδ-οῖν*, *ἵππ-οῖν*. The contracted form *-οιν* and the Fem. *-αιν* do not occur. The Personal Pronouns have:—

1. Nom. Acc. *νῶϊ*, *νῶ* (*νῶϊν* Il. 16. 99, *σφῶϊν* Od. 23. 52?); Gen. Dat. *νῶϊν*.
2. Nom. Acc. *σφῶϊ*, *σφῶ*; Gen. Dat. *σφῶϊν* (*σφῶν* Od. 4. 62).
3. Acc. *σφῶέ* (encl.); Dat. *σφῶϊν* (encl.).

104.] Instrumental. The Homeric poems have preserved many instances of an Ending *-φι(ν)*; *e.g.* *ῥρεσ-φιν*, *στήθεσ-φι*,

ναῦ-φιν, ζυγό-φι, βίη-φι, κοτυληδον-ό-φιν (Od.): probably also the Pronoun σ-φι(ν), Lat. *si-bi*. These are relics of an original *Instrumental Case*.

105.] Contraction, &c. The loss of ι, υ and σ between vowels (§ 94) does not generally lead to contraction in the Homeric dialect: note that—

1. The Dat. Sing. of Stems in -εσ and -υ (Gen. -εος) often forms ει (for -ε-ι), but nearly always before a vowel, so that the ει is scanned as a short syllable (§ 380); e.g. τέλχει ὕπο Τρώων, ἦ ἔπει ἦ ἔργω, &c. No such rule will be found to hold for the Dat. Sing. of Stems in -ι, as πόλει, ἀγύρει &c.—either because -ει from -ε-ι became monosyllabic earlier than -ει from -εσ-ι or -εφ-ι; or because, as has been suggested (§ 99), the true form of the Dat. is πόλι, ἀγύρι, &c.

Exceptions, real or apparent, to this rule are—

Π. 6. 126 σῶ θάρσει (read θάρσει σῶ, cp. Π. 7. 153 θάρσει ῥ).

17. 647 ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλεσσον (read ἐν φάει).

23. 515 οὐ τι τάχει γε (read οὐ τάχει γε).

23. 639 πλήθει (read πληθυ).

Also οὔδει, Dat. of οὔδας (Π. 5. 734., 8. 385., 14. 467., 17. 92., 23. 719., 24. 527), for which read οὔδαι or οὔδα (§ 99).

2. The combinations -εα, -εο, -εω are often scanned as one syllable by 'Synizesis,' as θεοί (Π. 1. 18), σάκεα (Π. 4. 113), τεύχεα (Π. 7. 207, &c.); so with the Pronouns ἡμέας, ὑμέας, σφέας.

In Π. 1. 18 ὁμῶν μὲν θεοὶ δοῖεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες the word θεοί is not certain, since Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες the lords of Olympus is used as a Substantive, and θεοί is therefore unnecessary (Fick, *Ilias* p. 75).

3. The Gen. Sing. has -εως for -ε-ος in a few words; Ἐρέβους, θάρσεως, θέρεως, θάμβους—chiefly ἀπαξ εἰρημένα. It is probably better to write -εος and admit Synizesis.

On -ευ in ἐμεῦ, σεῦ, εὔ, τεῦ see § 378*.

4. Nouns with Stems in -εσ (as κλέος, δέος) and some Nouns in -ᾱs are liable to 'Hyphaeresis,' or dropping a vowel before another vowel: as κλέα (for κλέε-α), and so δυσκλέα, ἀκλέα, ἀκλέ-ες; νηλής, νηλεῖ, νηλέα (Neut. Sing. νηλεές); θεουδής, θεουδέα (for θεο-δής *god-fearing*), ὑπερδέα (Π. 17. 330); γέρα, δέπα, κέρα, κρέα, σφέλα (for γέρα-α, &c.), χρέα *debts* (Hes. Op. 647). Cp. δαί (for δαῖ-ι), Dat. of δαῖς; also ἀποαίρεο for ἀποαιρέ-εο (§ 5).

The forms κλέα (ἀκλέα, δυσκλέα), δέπα, κέρα, σφέλα are only found before hiatus; e.g. κλέα only occurs in the phrase κλέα ἀνδρῶν: so that we must either suppose -ᾱ to be shortened by the hiatus, or (better) read κλέε' ἀνδρῶν, &c. But γέρα occurs before a consonant (Π. 2. 237 γέρα πεσόμεν, and so

9. 334, Od. 4. 66). *κρέα* occurs in the phrase *κρέα ἔδμεναι*, and in one or two other places before a vowel; but more frequently it is followed by a consonant, and is to be scanned *κρέᾱ* or *κρέᾱ* (necessarily so in Od. 9. 347, where it ends the line). Possibly the *ᾱ* is shortened by the analogy of the ordinary Neut. Plur. forms in *-ᾱ* (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 348). Or, as is now maintained by Joh. Schmidt (*Pluralb.* p. 321 ff.), *κρέα*, *γέρα*, &c. are stems in *-ᾱ*, originally distinct from the corresponding stems in *-ᾱσ*, and are therefore properly Singular, but capable of being used in a collective sense. On this view *κρέᾱ* meant *flesh*, *κρέαα* *pieces of flesh*: cp. *μήρα* and *μηροί* (§ 99*). Schmidt does not admit hyphaeresis in most of these words, holding that it only occurred when *three* vowels came together in the oldest Greek: so that (e.g.) we may have *δέα* for *δφέα* (*δφεῖσ-α*), but not *κλέα* for *κλέφεα*.

5. There are also several contracted forms from Stems in *-εεσ* which offer some difficulty: *ἄκληις* (Il. 12. 316), *ἀκλειῶς* (Od. 1. 241., 14. 371), *ἔυκλειῶς* (Il. 22. 110), *ἐυκλείας* (Il. 10. 281, Od. 21. 331; al. *ἐυκλήας*), *ἀγακλῆος* (*ἀγακλείος* Hesych.), *Πατροκλῆος*, *Πατροκλήα*, *Ἡρακλῆος*, *Ἡρακλήα*, *Ἡρακλήϊ*, *Βαθυκλήα*, *Διοκλῆος*, *Διοκλήα*; *ῥαχρηίς*, *ῥαχρειῶν* (also *ῥαχρηῶν* Hesych.); *ἔρρρείος*; *δείους* (Il. 10. 376., 15. 4); *σπείους*, *σπηῖ*, *σπέσσι* and *σπήεσσι*.

But the *η* or *ει* always occurs where it can be resolved into *εε*, as *Πατροκλέε-ος*, *ἔρρρέε-ος*, *ἀκλέε-ως*, &c.; moreover the long final syllable so lost (e.g. in writing *ἀκλέε-ες*, *δέε-ος*, *σπέε-ος*) is never necessary to the metre. Hence we can hardly doubt that these are the true Homeric forms. So *κρειῶν* (Gen. Plur. of *κρέας*) should be *κρέᾱ-ων* (as in H. Merc. 130), or perhaps *κρεῖῶν* (see § 107, 3); and *ῥαχρηίς*, *ῥαχρειῶν* should be *ῥαχραῖές*, *ῥαχραῖῶν*. For *σπέσσι* we can read *σπέεσσι*.

The Voc. of *Πατροκλέης* should be written in the uncontracted form *Πατρόκλεες* in the phrase *Πατρόκλεες ἱππεῦ* (which ends the line in Il. 16. 20, 744, 812, 843), and also whenever it comes before the Bucolic Diaeresis (§ 368). When it stands at the beginning of the line (Il. 16. 693, 859) we should perhaps read *Πάτροκλος*: see § 164.

6. The Case-forms of Nouns in *-ως* and *-ω* (Gen. *-οος*) ought generally to be written without contraction; thus *ῥῶς*, Dat. *ῥοῖ*, Acc. *ῥῶα* (see § 368); *αἰδῶς*, Dat. *αἰδοῖ*, Acc. *αἰδῶα*; *ιδρῶς*, Acc. *ιδρῶα* (Il. 10. 574). But the Genitive in *-οῖς* (*ῥοῖς*, *Λητοῖς*, &c.) is required by the metre in several places. Naturally the contraction of *οο* was earlier than that of two *unlike* sounds, as *οι*, *οα*. See L. Meyer, *Decl.* 23.

106.] **Variation of the Stem.** The phonetic influence of the Ending on the form of the Stem, which plays so large a part in the inflexion of Non-Thematic Tenses, was originally no less important in the Nouns. In Sanscrit a Nominal Stem of the consonantal Declension appears in general in at least two forms,

a 'strong' and a 'weak' form; the strong form being used in the Nom. and Acc. Sing. and Dual and the Nom. Plur., the weak form in other Cases. The weak form, again, may have two degrees, which are then called the 'weak' or 'middle' and the 'weakest' form. A few traces of these variations remain in the Greek Declension:—

1. In the words of relationship, *πατήρ*, *μήτηρ*, &c. and in *άνήρ*. Thus we find Nom. *πατήρ*, Acc. *πατέρ-a*, but Gen. *πατρ-ός* (*πατέρ-os* only Od. 11. 500), Dat. *πατρ-ί* (sixty times in Homer, *πατέρ-ι* thrice); *μήτηρ*, Acc. *μητέρα* (only), Gen. and Dat. *μητρ-ός*, *μητρ-ί*, less commonly *μητέρ-os*, *μητέρ-ι*. *άνήρ* uses *άνερ-* and *άνδρ-* (for *άνρ-*) almost promiscuously; the latter is also seen in the Dat. Pl. *άνδρᾱ-σι* (for *άνδρ-σι*). The Gen. Plur. *δαέρων* (Il. 24. 769) is scanned as a spondee: it should probably be written *δαίφρ-ων*, the stem *δαίφρ-* standing to *δαήρ* (for *δαήρ*) as *άνδρ-* to *άνήρ* (Ebel, K. Z. i. 293).

2. *Ζεύς*, for *δηνύς* (Sanscr. *dyáus*) forms the Gen. and Dat. from the Stem *δиф*. The original Acc. is *Ζήν*, Sanscr. *dyám* (with loss of *u*): *Δία* follows the analogy of *Διός*, *Διί*. Similarly *βοῦς*, for **βωύς* (Sanscr. *gáus*), Gen. *βοφ-ός*, Acc. in Hom. *βῶν* (Sanscr. *gám*). *κύων*, Voc. *κύον*, forms the other Cases from the Stem *κύν-*. Cp. Sanscr. *çvan*, Acc. *çvān-am*, Gen. *çun-as*, &c. The Acc. *κύν-a* (like *Δία*) follows the analogy of the Gen. and Dat.

Similarly, **φρήν* a *lamb* (surviving in *πολύ-ρρην-ες*) forms Gen. *άρν-ός* (for *φρν-ός*), &c.

3. Adjectives in *-εις*, Gen. *-εντος* (Stem *-φεντ-*), form the Dat. Plur. in *-εσσι*, *-εσι*. To explain this we must first suppose the weak Stem in *φάρ-* (with *ᾱ* for *εν*, cp. § 31, 5 and § 37), which would give a Dat. Plur. in *-ασσι*, *-ᾱσι*; this form then was assimilated to the other Cases by change of *ᾱ* to *ε*. A form in *-ασσι* has survived in *φρασί** for *φρεσί* (*φρά: φρεν = φᾶτ: φεντ*). In the same way *δαίμοσι*, *ποιμέσι*, &c. are not for *δαίμον-σι*, *ποιμέν-σι*, but for **δαίμᾱ-σι*, **ποιμᾱ-σι*. The Adverb *ἀγκάς* has been explained as *ἀγκάσ(ι)*, the true Dat. Plur. of *ἀγκών*.

4. The primitive variation sometimes gives rise to parallel forms of a word: e.g. *πῶξ* and *πράξ* a *hare* (*πήσσω*), which originate in the declension *πῶξ*, Acc. *πῶκ-a*, Gen. *πτακ-ός*. So from *πούς* and Lat. *pēs*, *ped-is* we may infer original *πούς* (or rather *πῶς*), Acc. *πῶδα* or *πῶδα*, Gen. *πεδ-ός*: and so in other cases †.

* Found in Pindar, also in an Old Attic inscription given by Joh. Schmidt, K. Z. xxv. p. 38.

† Much, however, remains uncertain in the attempts that have been made to reconstruct the primitive declension of these and similar words. The Sanscrit forms would furnish a fairly complete key, but for two defects: (1)

107.] Heteroclitite Nouns. This term is applicable to Nouns that employ distinct Stems. The chief variations are—

1. Between the vowel Declension (Stems in -ο and -ᾱ, -η) and the corresponding consonantal forms :—

δίπτυχο-ς; Acc. δίπτυχ-α.

ἐρίηρο-ς; Plur. ἐρίηρ-ες, ἐρίηρ-ας.

(ἀνδράποδο-ν post-Hom.); Dat. Plur. ἀνδραπόδ-εσσι.

ἀλκή; Dat. ἀλκ-ί.

ὑσμίνη; Dat. ὑσμίν-ι.

ἰωκή; Acc. ἰωκ-α.

Ἀΐδη-ς, Gen. Ἀΐδα-ο; also Ἀΐδ-ος, Dat. Ἀΐδ-ι.

φυλάκους (or φυλακούς, as Aristarchus accented the word); also φύλακ-ας, Dat. Plur. φυλάκ-εσσι.

ῥοσσε, Dat. Plur. ῥοσσοισι (Hes. Sc. 426).

πολλό-ς and πολύ-ς are both declined throughout: so δάκρυο-ν and δάκρυ.

2. With forms in -τ or -ᾗτ :—

γόνυ, Gen. γουνός (for γονφ-ός), Plur. γούν-α, γούν-ων, γούν-εσσι; also γούνατ-ος, &c.

δόρυ, Gen. δουρός (for δορφ-ος), &c.; δούρατ-ος, &c.

ὄνειρο-ς; Plur. όνειρατ-α.

πρόσωπο-ν; Plur. προσώπατ-α, Dat. προσώπασι. Hence the form ὦπα (εἰς ὦπα ἰδέσθαι, κατ' ἔν-ωπα ἰδών) may be a Neut. Sing.: cp. Æolic ὄππατα *eyes* *.

οὖς; Gen. οὔατ-ος, Dat. Plur. οὔασι and ὠσί.

ἡμαρ (cp. ἡμέρ-α); ἡματ-ος, &c. (cp. ἡμάτ-ιος). So πείραρ (πείρατ-α), ἡπαρ, οὔθαρ, εἶδαρ, ὄνειαρ, φρεῖαρ, κτέαρ, ἄλειφαρ, στέαρ.

ὔδαρ, ὕδατ-ος. See § 114*, 8, d.

χάρις, Acc. χάρι-ν (cp. χαρί-εις); Plur. χάριτ-ες, &c.

μέλι (μέλιτ-ος, μέλιτ-ηδέα); μέλιτ-ος, &c.

χρῶς, χρο-ός, χρο-ί, χρο-α; also χρωτ-ός (Il. 10. 575) and χρῶτ-α (Od. 18. 172, 179).

We should add the whole class of Nouns in -μα, Gen. -ματ-ος: since the -μα of the Nom. Acc. is not for -ματ, but answers to the Latin -men, Gen. -min-is.

3. Between -ασ- and -εσ- :—

τέρας, τέραα, τερά-ων, τερά-εσσι; but τείρεα (in the sense of 'stars,' Il. 18. 485).

the Sanscr. *a* may represent either *ε* or *ο*, so that (e. g.) *padās* may be *ποδός* or *πεδός*, and similarly *ā* may be *η* or *ω*: and (2) Sanscr. *ā* often answers to Greek *ο*, so that (e. g.) *pādām* may point to either *πόδα* or *πᾶδα*. See Joh. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxv. 23 ff., Brugmann, *Grundr.* i. § 311, p. 251.

* The old explanation of ὄππα from ὄπ-μα, by 'progressive assimilation,' seems to be groundless.

οὔδας, οὔδε-ος, &c. : so κῶας, κῶε-α, κτέρας, κτέρε-α (and New Ionic γέρεα, &c. ; Attic βρέτους, κνέφους).

This variation doubtless arose from the Ionic change of *δο, δω* into *εο, εω*. Thus the *ε* first appeared in the Gen., giving (e. g.) *τέρας, τέρεος, τέραι*, Plur. *τέραα, τερέων, τέρασι* or *τερά-εσσι*. Then *ε* was extended to other Cases, and on the other hand *α* was sometimes restored, as in *τεράων, κρεάων*. See § 106, 4, and Joh. Schmidt, *Phuralb.* p. 325.

4. Comparatives in *-ων* (Gen. *-ον-ος*) sometimes form Cases as if by contraction with a Stem in *-οσ* ; *ἀμείνω* (for *ἀμείνοσ-α*, *ἀμείνο-α*), *πλείους* (for *πλείοσ-ες*), *ἀρείους* (§ 114* 7 ; § 121).

5. Other variations are—

ἡνίοχο-ς ; Acc. *ἡνιοχῆ-α*, Nom. Plur. *ἡνιοχῆ-ες*.

Αἰθίοπ-ες, &c., but Acc. *Αἰθιοπῆ-ας*.

Ἀντιφάτη-ς, Acc. *Ἀντιφατῆ-α*.

Ἄρης, Voc. *Ἄρες* ; Gen. *Ἄρη-ος* and *Ἄρε-ος*, &c. ; Acc.

Ἄρηα and once *Ἄρη-ν* (Il. 5. 909).

ζῆς, Acc. *ζαῆ-ν* (Od. 12. 313) : see § 97.

λᾶ-ς, Acc. *λᾶ-ν* ; Gen. *λᾶ-ος*, Dat. *λᾶ-ϊ*, Dual *λᾶε*, Plur.

λᾶ-ες, *λᾶ-ων*, *λᾶ-εσσι*. The latter forms are doubtless by hyphaeresis (§ 105, 4) for *λᾶα-ος*, &c.

γρηῦς, Dat. *γρηῖ*, as if from a monosyllabic *γρηῦς*.

μέγα (for *μεγῆ*, cp. *magn-us*), Masc. *μέγα-ς*, *μέγα-ν* ; the other Cases from the derivative stem *μεγα-λο-*.

Three apparently distinct Stems are used in *νίος son*, viz.—

(1) *νιό-ς*, Voc. *νιέ* ; the forms *νιού*, *νιῶ*, *νιόισι* are very rare in Homer.

(2) (*νίν-*), Acc. *νιέ-α*, Gen. *νιέ-ος*, Dat. *νιέ-ϊ*, Plur. *νιέ-ες*, *νιέ-ας* : and from these by hyphaeresis—

(3) Acc. *νι-α*, Gen. *νι-ος*, Dat. *νι-ι*, Dual *νι-ε*, Plur. *νι-ες*, *νι-ας*, *νιά-σι* ; cp. *γρηῦς*, *λᾶας*.

The form *νιάσι* (instead of *νιύ-σι*) follows the type *πατράσι*, &c.

The Neut. *κάρη head* forms—

(1) Gen. *καρήατ-ος*, *κάρητ-ος*, Dat. *καρήατ-ι*, *κάρητ-ι*.

(2) Gen. *κράατ-ος*, Dat. *κράατ-ι*, Plur. *κράατ-α(ᾶα)*.

(3) Acc. Sing. *κᾶτ-α* (Od. 8. 92), Gen. *κᾶτ-ός*, Dat. *κᾶτ-ί*, Plur. Gen. *κᾶτ-ων*, Dat. *κᾶσί*. The Dat. Sing. form *κράτεσφι* (Il. 10. 156) is quite anomalous*.

* We might add the stem *κρη-*, in *κατὰ κῆθεν* down from the head, cp. *κρή-δεμνον*, *κρή-νη*. The relations of these forms have hardly yet been satisfactorily cleared up : see especially Joh. Schmidt, *Phuralb.* p. 363 ff. It is highly probable that *κῆρας* is originally the same word, so that the original declension, answering to Sanscr. *çiras*, *çirshnás*, &c., was *κῆρας*, Gen. *κᾶ(σ)γός* and *κᾶ(σ)-ατος* (like *γόνυ*, Gen. *γόνυ-ός* and *γόνυ-ατος*, &c.). The form *κάρη* must

The declension of ἔπος, γέλως and ἰδρῶς in Homer is open to some doubt ; it is clear however that the Stems in -τ are post-Homeric.

Nom. ἔπος occurs in Il. 14. 315, Acc. ἔρον in the phrase ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο *put away desire*, Dat. ἔρω in Od. 18. 212 ; Nom. ἔρως is read in Il. 3. 442., 14. 294, but the metre allows ἔρος in both places. ἔρωτ-α occurs first in H. Merc. 449.

Nom. γέλως occurs in Il. 1. 599, Od. 8. 326, 343, 344 : in the two last passages (in the Song of Demodocus) the metre is rather against γέλος. The Dat. γέλῳ occurs in Od. 18. 100 (most MSS. γέλω) ; the Acc. γέλον or γέλω in Od. 18. 350., 20. 346 (MSS. γέλων, γέλον, and γέλω). Thus the word may be either γέλο-s (Gen. -ου) or γέλως, Acc. γέλω (for γέλω-α or γέλο-α) : cp. αἰδῶ for αἰδῶα. The Stem γελοσ- appears in γελοῖος, cp. αἰδοῖος, ἡοῖος.

From ἰδρῶς we have Acc. ἰδρῶ ; but this must be read ἰδρῶα in one place (Il. 10. 574 ἰδρῶ πολλόν at the end of the line), and always may be so read. The Dat. is ἰδρῶ (Il. 17. 385, 745), possibly to be written ἰδρῶι. Hence ἰδρῶς is probably like χρῶς.

Two other Case-forms of this type are ἰχῶ (Il. 5. 416), Acc. of ἰχάρ, and κυκεῶ (Il.) or κυκεῶ (Od.), Acc. of κυκεάν. Cp. also αἰῶ (Aesch. fr. 413), Acc. of αἰών.

The history of all these instances is very similar. The original Stem ended with a spirant (commonly σ), the loss of which in the oblique Cases caused hiatus (-οος, -οῖ, -οα, &c.) : then these forms were replaced by adopting Stems in -τ and -ν. Cp. § 114*, 6-8.

108.] Heteroclite Pronouns. The following points remain to be noticed :—

1. The stems ἐμε (με) and ἐε, ἐ do not form a Nom. Sing.

It is evident that the original Nom. coalesced at a very early period with the Stem of the Verb, becoming the ending -μτ ; just as the French *je* has ceased to be used except in a fixed place before the Verb, so that it is hardly a separate word.

In the Plural also the Nom. was not originally formed from the same Stems as the oblique Cases. Both ἄμμε-s, ὑμμε-s and ἡμέ-es, ὑμέ-es are comparatively late, and due to the analogy of the Nominal declension (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 388).

2. The Interrogative and Indefinite τίς is declined from three Stems, viz.

(1) τι-, giving Neut. τί (for τῖδ), also the Plur. Neut. traceable in ἄσσα (for ἄ τῖα). The Indef. ἄσσα occurs in Od. 19. 218 ὀπποῖ' ἄσσα, where it would be better to write ὀπποῖά 'σσα (for τῖα).

(2) τε-, giving Gen. τέο, τεῦ (cp. ἐμέο, &c.), Dat. τέῳ, τῷ (Il. 16. 227, H. Apoll. 170).

Gen. τέων (ἐῶ), Dat. in ὁ-τέοισι (ἐοῖ), Il. 15. 491.

(3) τν-, giving Acc. τίν-α, Dat. (very rarely) τίν-ι, Plur. Nom. τίνες (only in the Od.).

have been originally a derivative, introduced to mean *head* when κέρα had come to be limited to the sense of *horn*. From it again κερή-ατος, &c. were obtained by analogy.

In the Compound $\delta\sigma\text{-}\tau\iota\varsigma$ the first part is sometimes declined as $\delta\varsigma$, η , δ , sometimes undeclined, giving $\delta\text{-}\tau\iota\varsigma$, $\delta\text{-}\tau\epsilon\nu$, &c. The Neut. Plur. is once $\delta\text{-}\tau\iota\nu\text{-}\alpha$ (Il. 22. 450), usually $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\alpha$.

In the forms with $\tau\tau$, $\pi\pi$ (as $\delta\tau\tau\iota$, $\delta\pi\pi\omega\varsigma$) we have to recognise the original Neuter $\delta\delta$ (Sanscr. *yad*). Thus $\delta\delta\ \tau\iota$ becomes $\delta\tau\ \tau\iota$ (not $\delta\sigma\tau\iota$, since $\tau\iota$ is a distinct word, not a Suffix). In $\delta\tau\tau\epsilon\omicron$, which occurs in the Odyssey (1. 124., 17. 121., 22. 377), $\delta\delta\text{-}$ is indeclinable (cp. $\delta\text{-}\tau\iota\varsigma$), and so in $\delta\pi\pi\omega\varsigma$, $\delta\pi\pi\omicron\sigma\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\pi\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma$, &c. For the assimilation we may compare $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\delta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\kappa\grave{\alpha}\pi\ \pi\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$, &c. (for $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\ \pi\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$).

3. The Article is declined from two Stems:—

$\delta\text{-}$, Fem. $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}$, which gives $\acute{\omicron}$, $\acute{\eta}$, $\acute{\omicron}\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\iota$: perhaps also $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ *thus*, if it is distinct from the Relativial $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ *as*.

$\tau\omicron\text{-}$, Fem. $\tau\acute{\alpha}\text{-}$, which gives the other Cases, and second forms of the Nom. Plur. $\tau\omicron\iota$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota$: also the Adverb $\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ *thus*.

The Compound $\delta\text{-}\delta\epsilon$ uses the Stem $\delta\text{-}$ for the forms $\delta\text{-}\delta\epsilon$, $\eta\text{-}\delta\epsilon$, $\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\delta\epsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\delta\epsilon$, and the Adverb $\acute{\omega}\text{-}\delta\epsilon$. The second part is sometimes declined in the Dat. Plur., $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\text{-}\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota\nu$ or $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\text{-}\delta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ (Il. 10. 462 and Od.). The $\text{-}\delta\epsilon$ is enclitic: hence the accent, $\eta\text{-}\delta\epsilon$, not $\acute{\eta}\delta\epsilon$. Strictly, therefore, it should be written $\delta\ \delta\epsilon$, $\eta\ \delta\epsilon$, &c.

The forms $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$, $\sigma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$, &c. are post-Homeric. The earliest instance of a Compound of this kind is the word $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\tau\eta$, in Hes. Th. 216.

Adverbial Suffixes.

109.] The Suffixes employed in Homer to form Adverbs are as follows:—

$\text{-}\theta\iota$ expresses the *place where*: the chief instances are—from Pronouns and Prepositions, $\tau\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\delta\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\alpha\tilde{\nu}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\text{-}\theta\iota$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\text{-}\theta\iota$ only Od. 17. 10), $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\upsilon\psi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\upsilon\text{-}\theta\iota$; from Nouns, $\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\theta\acute{\eta}\rho\eta\text{-}\theta\iota$ (Od. 14. 352), $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\eta\acute{\omega}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\kappa\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$; $\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\iota}\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\kappa\omicron\rho\iota\nu\theta\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\beta\upsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\iota$. Note that $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ is not found in Homer.

$\text{-}\theta\alpha$ *place*; $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\text{-}\theta\alpha$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\text{-}\theta\alpha$, $\upsilon\pi\alpha\iota\text{-}\theta\alpha$ (cp. also $\delta\eta\theta\acute{\alpha}$, $\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\nu\theta\alpha$).

$\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$ *place*, from Prepositions; $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\sigma\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$, $\delta\pi\iota\sigma\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$ and $\delta\pi\iota\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$, $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\iota\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\rho\text{-}\theta\epsilon(\nu)$.

$\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$ *place whence*, used with nearly the same Stems as $\text{-}\theta\iota$; $\delta\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\upsilon\psi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\omicron\text{-}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$. From Nouns, $\eta\acute{\omega}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\Delta\acute{\iota}\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$ (Il.), $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, &c.

This Suffix is often used with the Prepositions $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ and $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}$, as $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \Delta\acute{\iota}\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\ \omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\nu$, &c. With the Stems $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon$, $\sigma\epsilon$, $\acute{\epsilon}$, it forms a Genitive; as Il. 1. 280 $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\nu\ \delta'\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$. The form $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\nu$ is only found in the Iliad.

$\text{-}\theta\omicron\iota$, only in $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\nu\text{-}\theta\omicron\iota$ *there* (Od.).

-τος *place*; ἐν-τός, ἐκ-τός. Originally, perhaps, it expressed the *place whence*, as Lat. *caeli-tus*, *divini-tus*.

-τις, in αὐ-τις *back, again* (Attic αὐ-θις).

-σε *place whither*; πό-σε, ὁπό-σε, κεί-σε, ἐτέρω-σε, ἀμφοτέρω-σε, ὁμό-σε. From Nouns, πάντο-σε, κυκλό-σε.

-φι(ν), -φίς, in νόσ-φι(ν) *apart*, λικρι-φίς *sideways* (Il. 14. 463). This may be the Instrumental Ending -φι(ν).

-φα, in μέσ-φα *until*, lit. *meanwhile* (Il. 8. 508).

-χι, in ἧ-χι *where* (lit. *which way*, Lat. *quā*).

-χα, with Numerals; δι-χα *two ways*, τρί-χα, πέντα-χα, ἑπτα-χα.

-χθα, in the same sense, τρι-χθα, τετρα-χθα.

-κίς, -κι; with Numerals, in δεκά-κίς, τετρά-κίς, εἰνά-κίς, εἰκοσά-κίς; and with similar meaning πολλάκίς and πολλάκι, ὁσάκι, τοσάκι.

The original Suffix is -κίς or -κι (not -άκίς), but in consequence of its having been used at first with Stems ending in -ᾱ (τετρά-, ἑπτά-, δεκά-, εἰνά-), the combination -α-κίς came to be felt as the Suffix, and was extended to other words by analogy. A similar explanation applies to the ᾱ of πέντα-χα.

-κας expresses *manner*; ἀνδρα-κάς = Lat. *viritim*.

-δε *place whither*, suffixed to the Accusative; οἰκόν-δε, πόλε-μόνδε, ἄλαδε. This Suffix is peculiar in being an enclitic; in strictness we should write οἰκόν δε, πόλεμόν δε, &c.

-δις expresses *direction* or *manner*; χαμά-δις, ἄνω-δις, ἄλλω-δις, ἐπαμοιβά-δής (Od. 5. 481).

110.] **Case-forms as Adverbs.** The Suffixes which follow have been explained, with more or less probability, as Case-Endings.

-α *manner*; ἄρ-α (lit. *fittingly*), ἄμ-α, μάλ-α, θάμ-α, τάχ-α, σάφ-α, κάρτ-α, ῥεῖ-α or ῥέ-α, ὤκ-α, ἦκ-α, αἰψ-α, λίγ-α, σίγ-α, ῥίμφ-α, πύκ-α, λίπ-α; in Attic κρύφ-α, ἡρέμ-α.

The Adverbs in -ᾱ belong to an early stage of Greek, most of them being confined to Homer. They have generally been taken to be primitive Instrumental forms (so Brugmann, *M. U.* ii. 158, *G. G.* § 83). It is a question, however, whether the original Instr. ending was -ᾱ or -ε: see Joh. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxvii. 292. Those which answer to adjectives in -ύς, viz. τάχα, ὥκα, λίγα, κάρτα, θάμα, are explained by Joh. Schmidt as older Neut. Plur. forms (ταχF-α, &c.), cp. αἰπά Neut. Plur. of αἰπύς, and πρέσβᾱ (for πρεσβF-ᾱ?) Fem. of πρέσβυς. This will not apply to ἄρα, μάλα (since ἄρ-φα, μαλ-φα would give ἄρα, μάλα). Some may be stems in -η, like μέγα: cp. λίγα and λιγαίνω (-ηω), λίπα and λιπαίνω, πύκα and πυκνός, also the stems κρεᾱ-, γερα- (§ 105, 4).

-η or -η *way, direction*; ἦ, τῆ, πῆ, θῆ (or πῆ, δῆ), πάντ-η, λάθρη. These forms represent the Instrumental of the *way by which* (Lat. *quā*, &c.).

It is a question whether they should be written with *iota subscr.* or not. The ancient grammarians prescribed *iota* (Apoll. de Adv. 625, 1), and this is

confirmed by the forms $\tilde{\alpha}$, $\delta\tilde{\alpha}$, $\delta\lambda\tilde{\alpha}$, $\pi\alpha\tau\tilde{\alpha}$ on Doric inscriptions (Ahrens, ii. 369). In Homer however the final vowel of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta$ (or $-\eta$) is frequently shortened before another vowel, which is rarely done in the case of final $-\eta$ (§ 380). It is not unlikely therefore that the original Instrum. Fem. $-\eta$ took *iota subscript* from the analogy of the Dat. Fem. in $-\eta$. There were also Doric adverbs of *place* in $-\eta$ or η ($\pi\acute{\eta}$ ποκα, ἐκατερῇ, see Ahrens, ii. 362, Brugmann, M. V. ii. 244), in which η is of course pan-Hellenic; but Ionic $\pi\tilde{\eta}$, &c. are connected by the meaning with the Doric forms in $-\alpha$. Cp. also λάθηρ ($-\eta$) with Attic λάθρᾱ (or $-\alpha$). The form $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta$ is an extension of the ending $-\eta$ to the consonantal declension (as with the adverbs in $-\omega\varsigma$).

$-\epsilon\iota$, $-\iota$ *time, manner*; $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron-\nu\chi-\epsilon\iota$ (or $-\iota$) *that very night*, II. 8. 197; $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\chi-\iota$ *in three rows*, $\alpha\nu\alpha\iota\mu\omega\tau-\iota$ (ι) *bloodlessly*, $\alpha\mu\omicron\gamma\eta\tau-\iota$, $\alpha\mu\alpha\chi\eta\tau\iota$, $\alpha\nu\omicron\tau\eta\tau\iota$, $\alpha\nu\iota\delta\rho\omega\tau\iota$, $\alpha\nu\omega\iota\sigma\tau\iota$, $\epsilon\gamma\rho\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\tau\iota$: with ι , $\epsilon\kappa\eta\tau\iota$ *with the will*, $\delta\epsilon\kappa\eta\tau-\iota$ *without the will*, $\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau-\iota$ *limb by limb*, $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\omega\sigma\tau\iota$ *in mighty fashion*.

Short ι is certain in $\epsilon\kappa\eta\tau\iota$, $\delta\epsilon\kappa\eta\tau\iota$, $\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\iota$, $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\omega\sigma\tau\iota$, and is not excluded by the metre in $\alpha\mu\omicron\gamma\eta\tau\iota$ and $\alpha\mu\alpha\chi\eta\tau\iota$. Where the syllable is long the MSS. are usually divided between $-\epsilon\iota$ and $-\iota$. The evidence of inscriptions is strongly in favour of $-\epsilon\iota$ (H. W. Smyth, *The reduction of $\epsilon\iota$ to ι in Homer*, p. 10): but $-\iota$ can hardly be due to mere itacism, and we have further to explain the forms in $-\iota$. The generally accepted view is that $-\epsilon\iota$ is the original Locative ending of the α -declension, which is preserved in the Doric adverbs $\epsilon\iota$, $\pi\epsilon\iota$, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota$, $\tau\eta\upsilon\epsilon\iota$, &c., also in $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\iota$ (Menander fr. 456). On this view short ι must be the corresponding ending of the consonantal declension, and the analogy of forms of that declension must have been extended so as to create a new adverbial ending $-\iota$ (cp. $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\rho\tau\iota$ in Soph.). The $-\iota$ of $\alpha\nu\alpha\iota\mu\omega\tau\iota$, &c., if not a mere error, may be due to contamination between $-\epsilon\iota$ and $-\iota$.

$\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$ has been taken to be a Loc. from the stem $\alpha\iota\phi\epsilon\sigma-$ (of which the Doric $\alpha\iota\epsilon\varsigma$ is the Acc.). Mr. H. W. Smyth (l. c.) justly objects to this that the Homeric form would be $\alpha\iota\phi\acute{\epsilon}\iota$: and this form, we may add, would become $\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$, not $\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota$. Hence he derives it from the stem $\alpha\iota\phi\omicron-$, Lat. *aero-m*.

A different account of the Adverbs in $-\epsilon\iota$ and $-\iota$ is given by Mahlow (*Die langen Vocale*, p. 121). Noticing that they are mainly compounds, especially with α *priv.*, he compares the numerous Latin adjectives such as *ex-animi-s*, *in-ermi-s*, *in-belli-s*, and shows that change to an I-stem is found in similar words in other European languages. This I-stem in the Acc. Neut. gives the adverbs in $-\iota$, in the Loc. those in $-\epsilon\iota$ or $-\iota$. On this view the doubt between $-\epsilon\iota$ and $-\iota$ is the same that we meet with in the Dat. of Nouns in $-\iota\varsigma$ (§ 98).

$-\omega\varsigma$ *manner*; a Suffix of which there are comparatively few examples in Homer: the commonest are from Stems in $-\omicron$, viz. $\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\omicron\upsilon\tau\text{-}\omega\varsigma$ (also $\omicron\upsilon\tau\text{-}\omega$), $\delta\mu\text{-}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\text{-}\omega\varsigma$, $\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\varsigma$, $\delta\sigma\pi\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$, $\rho\eta\eta\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$, $\epsilon\kappa\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\lambda\omega\varsigma$, $\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\varsigma$ (rare); from other Stems, $\alpha\phi\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\omega\varsigma$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\phi\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\omega\varsigma$.

$-\omega$, chiefly from Prepositions; $\epsilon\iota\sigma\text{-}\omega$, $\xi\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\omega$, $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\sigma\sigma\text{-}\omega$, $\delta\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\text{-}\omega$, $\alpha\nu\text{-}\omega$, $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\text{-}\omega$, $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\rho\text{-}\omega$ (*further on*), $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\text{-}\omega$, $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\text{-}\omega$ (*farther, farthest*), $\delta\sigma\sigma\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\text{-}\omega$ *nearer*.

Two others are Adverbs of *manner*, $\tilde{\omega}\text{-}\delta\epsilon$, $\omicron\upsilon\tau\text{-}\omega$ (for which $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ is only written when a vowel follows in the same sentence).

The ending *-ως* has long been considered to be the Greek form of the original Ablative *-ōt* (Lat. *-ōd*) of *o*-stems. In Greek, however, a final *-d* would disappear (as in ἄλλο, Lat. *aliu-d*, &c.) and consequently the theory applies only to the forms without *-s*, viz. ὤδε and οὕτω. The difficulty was met by Curtius (*Curt. Stud.* x. 219) with the suggestion that *-τ* would pass into *-s* before a dental or *σ*: e.g. οὕτως σοί, οὕτως τίθημι for οὕτωτ σοί, οὕτωτ τίθημι. When two forms οὕτω and οὕτως had thus come into existence as 'sentence-doubles' (like οὐ and οὐκ, ἐξ and ἐκ), it would be natural to use οὕτως when it served to prevent hiatus, and the more regular οὕτω in other cases. This explanation was rejected by later scholars (as Brugmann and G. Meyer), and is certainly not quite satisfactory. If Curtius is right we should expect ὅτ δέ to become ὤσδε rather than ὤδε. His view is however defended by Joh. Schmidt (*Pluralb.* p. 352).

The ending *-ω* in *άν-ω*, &c. may be either the Ablative *-ōt*, or (more probably) an Instrumental ending *-ō* (Mahlow, *Die langen Vocale*, p. 86). In Latin, as Mahlow shows, it is probable that the Instrum. is represented by the adverbs in *-ō*, as *modo*, *cito*, the Abl. by archaic *-ōd*, later *-ō*. If *-ως* and *-ω* were alternative Ablative endings—sentence-doubles—it seems possible that the adoption of *-ως* rather than *-ω* in the Adverbs of manner was partly determined by the circumstance that *-ω* was already familiar in the Instrumental use.

The extension of *-ως*, *-ω* to the consonantal declension presents no difficulty. It may be observed, perhaps, that the proper Ablat. of that declension was unsuited for adverbial use, because it was the same in form as the Genitive: e.g. ταχέος was already = *of a swift*, and accordingly a new word ταχέως *swiftly* was coined on the model of φίλος, &c.*

-ου place; ποῦ, ὅμῳ, ἀγγοῦ, τηλοῦ, ὑψοῦ, αὐτοῦ,—all periphrases. They are the same in meaning as the corresponding Adverbs in *-όθι*.

-δον, *-δην*, *-δα*, forming Adverbs of manner, are evidently Accusatives from Stems in *-δο-*, *-δη-* (§ 114); e.g. σχεδόν *nearly*, lit. *holding-wise*, ἀποσταδόν *aloof*, ἐμβαδόν *on foot*, ἀμφοδόν *openly*, ἑταδόν *in crowds*; so βοτρυνδόν, πυργηδόν, ῥυδόν, συνωχαδόν, &c.; βάδην *steppingly*, τμήδην, κρύβδην, κλήδην, ἐπιγράβδην, &c. (all from Verbs), also a peculiar group in *-άδην*, as ἐπιστροφάδην *wheeling about*, προτροπάδην *headlong*, ἐπιτροχάδην, μεταδρομάδην, ἀμβολάδην; μίγδα, κρύβδα, ἀποσταδά, ἀμφοδά, ἀναφανδά, αὐτοσχεδά. It is evident that these are much more numerous than the Noun-Stems in *-δο*, *-δη* can ever have been. In such cases we have to explain, not the derivation of the individual forms, but the origin of the type.

Other Adverbs obtained from Accusatives are: ἄκην *in silence*,

* As adverbs of the Gen. Abl. form (ταχέος, &c.) must have existed at one time alongside of those in *-ωτ* from *o*-stems, the conjecture may be hazarded that this adverbial *-ως* was one of the influences which determined the choice of *-ως* rather than *-ω* for original *-ōt*. If so, such a form as πάντ-ως is a sort of contamination of the Gen. Abl. παντ-ός and the forms in *-ω(s)*.

ἄντην (ἀντίον, ἐναντίον, &c.) *opposite*, πάλιν *backwards*, δὴρόν *long*, σχεδὴν *hand to hand*, ἀμφοδίην *openly*, ἀπριάτην *without purchase*; perhaps also ἄγχι *near*, ὕψι *aloft*, ἱφί *mightily*. The form ἱφί is generally taken as the Instrum. of ἱ-s *force* (§ 104): but this does not explain how it comes to be used as a Stem in the Adj. ἱφί-α (μῆλα), as well as in Compounds, Ἱφί-άνασσα, &c. (Bekker, *H. B.* i. 160).

Many Adverbs are formed with a final -s, which is liable to be lost before a word beginning with a consonant, as οὕτω(s) and the Adverbs in -κι(s) already mentioned; other Homeric instances are, ἄχρι(s) and μέχρι(s) *until*, ἰθύ(s) *straight towards*, μεσσηγύ(s) *between*, ἀπρέμα(s) *quietly*: also the Prep. ἀμφί, Adv. ἀμφίς, and Homeric ἀντικρύν, later ἀντικρύς. Similar Adverbs in which -s is not lost are, ἄλι-s, μόγι-s, χωρί-s; ἀγκάς, ἐκά-s, πέλα-s, ἐντυπός (Il. 24. 163); ἐγγύ-s; χθέ-s; and those in -δι-s, as ἄλλυδις, ἀμοιβηδὶς. Note also the group formed by -s subjoined to a monosyllabic Verbal Stem; πύξ *with the fist*, ἐπὶ-μῖξ *in confusion*, ἄ-παξ *once*, μάψ *idly*, ὀ-δάξ *with the teeth* (δάκ-νω). The nature of this -s is obscure. Brugmann (*K. Z.* xxiv. 74) connects it with the -s of the Prepositions ἐξ, ἄψ, ἀμφι-s, holding that it is Ablatival. Joh. Schmidt (*Pluralb.* 357) supposes a group of Neuter stems, like the nouns in -as, -es, &c.

Accentuation of Case-forms.


III.] For the purpose of accentuation Nouns may be divided into those in which the accent remains on the Stem (and as far as possible on the same syllable of the Stem), and those in which it passes in the Gen. and Dat. to the Case-Ending.

Nouns of the Vowel-Declensions generally belong to the first of these groups. The last syllable if accented has the acute in the Nom. and Acc., the circumflex in the Gen. and Dat., and in the Adverbs in -ου and -ως: *e.g.* καλός, καλοῦ, καλῶ &c., Adv. καλῶς; but Acc. Plur. καλοῦς. On the Nouns in -ᾱ, see § 96.

One or two Feminines with Nom. Sing. in -ᾱ accent the Ending in those Cases in which the last syllable is long, as μία, Gen. μῆς; ἰα, Dat. ἱῇ; παρφύς *thick*, Fem. παρφεῖα, but Plur. παρφεία, Acc. παρφεῖας; ἄγυια *street*, Gen. ἀγυιῆς, Plur. ἀγυιαί, ἀγυιάς. So θαμειά and θαμειάς answer to a Nom. Sing. θαμεία, Masc. *θαμός (cp. θαμέ-ες, θαμέας); and καυστειρῆς (Il. 4. 342, &c.) is Gen. of καύστειρα.

αὐτως *in the very way* (from αὐτός), is made barytone by the authorities. The word is only Homeric, and the original accentuation αὐτῶς had evidently been lost, perhaps by a confusion with οὕτως.

The oxytone Adverbs in -ει and -ι, as αὐτονοχέι, ἀσπουδί, μελειστί, may date from a time when the Loc. of the ο- declension was regularly oxytone—the accent determining the appearance of ε for ο.



The second group consists of—

(1) Nouns with monosyllabic Stem, as πούς, ποδ-ός, ποδ-ί, ποδ-οῦν, ποδ-ῶν, ποσσί; κύων, κυν-ός, κυν-ί, κυν-ῶν, κυσί; θήρ, θηρ-ός, θηρ-ί, θηρ-ῶν, θηρ-σί.

(2) The words πατήρ, μήτηρ, θυγάτηρ, ἀνήρ, γαστήρ; Gen. πατρ-ός, μητρ-ός, θυγατρ-ός, ἀνδρ-ός, γαστρ-ός &c.

The accent of μήτηρ and θυγάτηρ is anomalous: cp. the Accusatives μητέρ-α, θυγατέρ-α. Probably the Nom. Sing. was originally oxytone. The change of accentuation may be explained by supposing that the Nom. was influenced by the accent of the Vocative—that in fact the Voc. *pro tanto* took the place of the Nom. (cp. § 96). It is evident that the Voc. of these words would be especially familiar to the ear.

The Dat. ending -εσσι never takes the accent; hence πόδ-εσσι, νή-εσσι, ἀνδρ-εσσι, κύν-εσσι, &c. The reason doubtless is that these are forms that have followed the analogy of the Stems in -εσ, as ἔπεσ-σι, βέλεσ-σι, &c.

The Genitives παῖδ-ων, δαδ-ων, Τρώ-ων, δμώ-ων, θά-ων, are barytone; perhaps because the Stems are originally disyllabic.

It appears that in an earlier stage of the language the shifting of the accent to the Case-Ending was always accompanied by 'weakening' of the Stem (§ 106). The few instances of the type of κύων, Gen. κυν-ός, and πατήρ, Gen. πατρ-ός, are to be regarded as surviving examples of the older declension.

112.] The Vocative in the Consonantal Declension sometimes retracts the accent, as πατήρ, Voc. πάτερ; δαήρ, Voc. δâερ; διογενής, Voc. διόγενες.

Proper Names with a long vowel in the penultimate are often properispomena, as Σαρπηδών, Voc. Σαρπηῶν; Ἀντήνωρ, Voc. Ἀντήνωρ; Μαχάων, Voc. Μαχᾶων. Otherwise they are mostly proparoxytone, as Ἀγάμεμνον, Ἀπολλων.

Oxytones in -εύς form the Voc. in -εῦ, as Ζεῦ, Ὀδυσσεῦ. This may be regarded as a retraction of the accent, since the circumflex stands for a double accent, viz. an acute followed by a grave in the same syllable (Ζεῦ = Ζέῦ).

Originally the Vocative, unless it stood at the beginning of a sentence, was enclitic. Hence the barytone accent is to be explained as in the case of the Verb (§ 87), viz. as the result of an original loss of accent.

CHAPTER VI.

FORMATION OF NOUNS.

113.] **Nominal Stems.** Some Nouns are formed with Stems identical with Verb-Stems; πτύχ-ες *folds* (πτύσσω for πτυχ-ιω), στίχ-ες *ranks* (στείχω, ἔ-στιχ-ον), φλόξ *flame* (φλέγω), πῶκ-α *cowering* (πτήσσω, ἔ-πτακ-ον), δῶ *house*, for δωμ, cp. δᾶ- (*dh*) in δά-πεδον (lit. *house-floor*), ῥῶπ-ας *twigs* (ῥέπ-ω), ῥῶγ-ας *clefts, openings* (ῥήγ-νυμι), θῶς *jackal* (θέω), ὄπ-α *voice* (φεπ-), φρίξ, θρίξ, Στύξ. In these Nouns the Stem is usually either in the weak form or in the O-form (§ 38).

Originally the Stem was long (and accented) in the Nom. and Acc., weak (with the accent on the Case-Ending) in the Gen. and Dat. Instances of this variation have been given in § 106; cp. § 114*.

Commonly however a Nominal Stem is formed from a Verb-Stem by means of one or more Suffixes, which we may call *Nominal Suffixes*. These are of two kinds:—

1. *Primary*, by which Nouns are formed from Verb-Stems; as -ο in ἀγ-ός *leader*, -τι in φά-τι-ς *saying*. Nouns so formed are called *Primitive* (sometimes *Verbal*: but this term is better known in a more restricted sense, § 84).

2. *Secondary*, by which Nouns are formed from other Nouns; as -ιο in δίκ-α-ιο-ς *just*, -ευ in ἵππ-εύ-ς *horseman*. These Nouns are called *Denominative*.

The Suffixes which mark the Feminine Gender might be classified as Secondary; thus the Stem καλη- might be said to be formed by a fresh suffix from καλο-, the Stem δμητειᾶ- (for δμη-τερ-ιᾶ) from δμη-τερ-, &c. But it is more convenient to treat the Feminine Endings as mere *inflections*, along with the corresponding Masc. forms.

In the same way we might treat Suffixes like -τρο (in ἰη-τρό-ς *healer*, ἄρο-τρο-ν *plough*) as compounded of -τηρ or -τερ (ἰη-τήρ *healer*, ἄρο-τήρ *ploughman*), and a secondary -ο. Practically, however, -τρο is a single Primary Suffix: and this applies also to -μνο (in βέλε-μνο-ν *dart*), which might be resolved into μο + εν + ο, and to many similar cases.

Primitive Nouns.

114.] Primary Suffixes. The form of the Verb-Stem in Primitive Nouns is liable to the same variations as in the Tenses (§ 38). It will be seen that these variations are connected with the accent; but this part of the subject will be best treated separately (§ 115).

The chief Primary Suffixes are as follows:—

-ο, Fem. -ᾱ, -η; the Verb-Stem taking three forms—

(1) The weak form; as ἀγ-ός-*s* *leader*, ζυγ-ό-ν *yoke*, φυγ-ή *flight*: with reduplication, λαχ-ή (Fi-Fαχ-ή) *cry*, ἵ-στο-ς (στα-) *web*.

(2) The O-form; as τόκ-ο-ς (τεκ-) *offspring*, ἀρωγ-ός-ς (ἀρήγ-ω) *helper*, σπονδ-ή (σπένδ-ω) *libation*, ποτ-ή *flight*, ροή *flow*.

(3) Attic reduplication; as ἀγ-ωγ-ή *leading*, ἀκωκή *point*, ἐδωδή *eating*, ὀπωπή *sight*, ὀδωδή *smell*. The radical vowel appears as ω.

-ι: as τρόφ-ι (τρέφ-ω) *thick*, τρόπ-ι-ς *keel of a ship*, φρόν-ι-ς *understanding* (with the Verb-Stem in the O-form).

-ια: seldom with Stems of clearly Verbal meaning, as in φύζα (φυγ-ια) *flight*, σχίζα (σχιδ-ια) *chip*; more often with roots used as Nouns, as δια (διφ-ια), πέζα (πεδ-), μνία (μνσ-), πίσσα (πίκ-); and as a Fem. suffix in Adjectives (*infra*).

The Greek -ια takes the place of -ι, the original declension of which is lost in Greek: see Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 109, p. 313; Joh. Schmidt, *Pluralb.* p. 42.

-υ: with two forms of declension—

(1) Gen. -ε-ος, with the weak Stem; chiefly in Masc. and Neut. Adjectives, as ταχ-ύ-ς *swift*, ταρφ-ύ-ς (τρέφ-ω) *thick*; βαθ-ύ-ς, λιγ-ύ-ς, γλυκ-ύ-ς, βαρύς, βραδύς, κρατύς, παχύς, εὐρύς (for ἐ-φρυ-, root φερ-). But ἡδύ-ς has the strong Stem: and ὠκύ-ς the O-form.

Fem. -εῖᾱ (for -εφ-ια), -εᾱ, as ἡδεῖα, ὠκέα.

(2) Gen. -υ-ος; in Substantives (chiefly Fem.), as πληθ-ύ-ς *multitude*, ἰθ-ύ-ς *path*, αἶμ, ἰλὺς *mud*, νέκ-υ-ς (Masc.) *corpse*, γενύ-ς *chin*, γῆρυ-ς *voice*, *cry*.

As to the declension of Nouns in -ις, Gen. -ιος, and -υς, Gen. -υος, see § 94.

-εσ, with the strong form of the Stem, as τέειχ-ος *wall*, τεύχ-ε-α *arms*, ἔπι-ος *word*, πένθ-ος *suffering*, βένθ-ος *depth* (cp. βαθ-ύ-ς), θέρ-ος *warmth*, *summer*, ἡδ-ος *pleasure*.

Fem. -εῖᾱ (for -εσ-ια), as ἡριγένεια.

The O-form of the Stem is found in ὄχ-ος *chariot* (cp. the Pf. ὄκωχα, § 26, 5); the weak form in θάλ-ος *blossom* (but cp. νεο-θηλ-ής), κάρτος (also κράτος), θάρσος (cp. Θερσ-ίτης, Ἀλι-θέρσ-ης), ἄχ-ος *grief*. The forms πάθ-ος, βάθ-ος are not Homeric.

Note however that in Homer the Substantive is *θάρος* (for which *θράσος* occurs only once, Il. 14. 416), the Adj. always *θρασύς*; so that a distinction of quantity is kept up in place of the original distinction between **θέρος* and *θραύς*. On *θέρος* as the original Greek form see Osthoff, *M. U.* ii. 49.

ι and υ appear in these Stems as in the Present tense (§ 29): e.g. *ρίγ-ος cold*, *ψύχ-ος warmth*, *κῦδ-ος glory*.

-ωσ, -οσ; in *ήώς* (Sanser. *ush-ás*) *dawn*, *αἰδώς shame*, and in the older declension of *γέλως*, *ἰδρως*, *αἰών*, *ἰχώρ* (§ 107 *ad fin.*). The Stem is probably in the weak form; see § 30.

-ασ; as *δέμ-ας 'build.'* The Stem is in the strong form; indeed the Stem-vowel is always ε, except in *γῆρας old age*, *κῶας fleece*, and *οὔδας floor*; cp. *γέρας*, *δέπας*, *κέρας*, *κνέφας*, *κρέας*, *κτέρας*, *πέρας*, *σέβας*, *σέλας*, *σφέλας*, *τέρας*: also **έρας* (*έραννός* for *ερασ-νός*) and **γέλας* (*έ-γέλασ-σα*).

-ευ, -ᾶν, -ον, -ων: e.g. *τέρ-ην*, Gen. -*εν-ος* (*τείρω*) *soft*, *ἄρσ-ην* *male*, *αὔχ-ήν* *neck*; *πέπ-ον* (Voc.) *tender one*, *ἀρηγ-όν-ες* *defenders*, *τέκτων*, *περι-κτίονες*; *ἀγκ-ών*, Gen. -*ων-ος* *elbow*, *ἀγών*, *αἶθων*.

Fem. -αινα (-*αν-ια*), in *λέαινα*: imitated by way of sarcasm in *θέ-αινα* (Il. 8. 5).

-υτ, -οντ, in Participles, and in a few Substantives, as *δράκ-ων* *a serpent*, lit. the 'staring' animal (*δέρκ-ομαι*), *τέν-ων*, *γέρων*.

-ᾱτ, in oblique Cases of Neuter Nouns as (*ῥῥωρ*), *ῥῥατ-ος*, &c. The ᾱ of this Suffix represents the weak form of a nasal syllable; see § 38, and § 114*, 8, c.

-αντ, notably in Compounds, as *ἀκάμας*, *ἀδάμας*, *πολύτλας*.

-ᾶν, in *τάλας*, *μέλας*: perhaps originally Stems in -αντ, which have followed the analogy of -εν, -ον (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 304).

-ερ, -ωρ, -ᾶρ; as *ἀήρ* (*ἄF-ήρ*) *air*, *αἰθ-ήρ* (*αἰθ-ω*) *bright sky*, *δα-ήρ* *husband's brother (levir)*; *ἐλ-ωρ* *booty*, *ῥδ-ωρ* *water*; *μάκ-αρ* *great* (Il. 11. 68), *ἔαρ* *spring*.

-ορ in the Homeric *ἄορ sword*, *ἦτορ breast* is perhaps only the Æolic form of -αρ (-*γ*). As to the Nom. and Acc. Neut. forms in -ωρ see § 114*, 8, d.

-ιο, -ιο is very rare in Greek as a Primary Suffix: Brugmann gives *ἐρείπ-ια ruins* and (post-Hom.) *ἄγ-ιος*, *στύγ-ιος*, *σφάγ-ιον*, *πάγ-ιος*. We may add *ταμ-λή dispenser*, *πεν-λή poverty*: also *διος* (*διF-ιος*) *bright*, *πεζός* (*πεδ-*) *on foot*, *κραδ-λή* (*κῆρ* for *κηρ-δ*) *heart*, in which the Stem is a Root-Noun.

The word *ἀ-οσση-τήρ helper* pre-supposes a Stem *όσσο-* for *σοκ-ιο-*, answering to Latin *soc-tu-s* (seq., Gr. *έπ-*).

In *ἄλλος* (*al-ius*), *μέσσος* (*medius*), *δεξιός* the Suffix appears to give the force of a Comparative: see Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 63, p. 125.

-ιος, -ισ, -ισ: the Comparative Suffix, as πλέω (πλε-ιος-α) πλείστος (πλε-ισ-τος): see § 114*, 7.

-FO: κεινός (κεν-Fός) *empty*, οὔλος (όλ-Fος) *whole*, λαι-ός *laevus*, ὀρθός *ard-uus*.

-Fεν, -Fον, -Fων, -Fν: πίων *fat*, αἰών *age, life* (Loc. αἰέν, see § 99), ἀ-πείρων (ἀ-περ-Fων, cp. πειραίνω for περ-Fν-ιω): -Fεν appears in the Inf. in -εν-αι, as εἰδέναι for Fιδ-Fέν-αι (§ 84).

-Fωσ, -Fωτ, Fem. -υῖα; in the Pf. Part., and in the Nouns ὄργ-υια *fathom*, ἄρπ-υια *storm-wind*, ἄγ-υια *street*.

-Fᾱρ; as πῖαρ (for πῖ-Fαρ) *fatness*, ὄνειαρ (ὄνη-Fαρ?) *help*, εἶδαρ (εἶδ-Fαρ) *fool*, εἶλαρ *shelter*, &c.; -Fερ in πείρα, Fem. of πίων *fat*. The ancient grammarians noticed that the Stem before -ᾱρ is long (Herodian ii. 769 ed. Lentz).

-μO; with the O-form, as πότ-μο-s (πετ-) *fall*, κορ-μό-s (κεῖρω) *a trunk*, ὄλ-μο-s (Fελ-) *a rolling stone*, ῥωχ-μός (ῥηγ-) *gully*.

-μι; in φῆ-μι-s *report*, δύνα-μι-s *power*.

-μῖν in ῥηγ-μῖν *beach on which the waves break*, Dat. ὑσμῖν-ι *fight*: also Nom. ὑσμῖνη.

-μεν, -μον, -μων; πυθ-μῆν (Gen. -μέν-ος) *base*, αὐτ-μῆν *breath*, λιμῆν *haven*, ποιμῆν *shepherd*, δει-μων (-μον-ος) *fearing*, μνή-μων *mindful*, ῥή-μων *shooter*, τέρ-μων *end*, θη-μῶν-α (Acc.) *a heap*. Also the Infinitives in -μεν-αι (Dat.) and -μεν (Loc.): see § 84.

-μαῖτ; as δει-μα, Gen. -ματ-ος, *fear*, ὄνομα *name*, &c.

Of these Suffixes -μον and -μαῖτ go with the strong form of the Stem, -μεν with the weak form.

With -ο, -η are formed -μενο (in Participles), and -μνο, -μνη, as βέλε-μνο-ν *a dart*, λί-μνη *a marsh*; -μνᾶ (-μν-μᾶ), in μέρι-μνα *care*.

-μαρ, -μωρ; as τέκ-μαρ and τέκ-μωρ *a device*; -μερο, in ἱ-μερο-s *desire*.

-νO, -ᾶνο; as δει-νό-s *fearful*, πτη-νός *flying*, τέχ-νη *art*, ποι-νή *atonement*; ὄχ-ανο-ν *handle*, δρεπάνη *sickle*, τρύπ-ανον *auger*, στέφ-ανος.

-νεσ; τέμε-νος *enclosure*, ἱχ-νος *imprint*, γλῆ-νος *jewel*.

-νυ; θρή-νυ-s *a foot-stool*.

-ρο, -λο; generally with the weak Stem; πικ-ρό-s *bitter*, ἄκ-ρο-s *point*, ἔδ-ρη *seat*: also with an auxiliary ᾱ, σθεν-αρό-s *strong*, ἀπαλός *tender*, στιβαρός, λιπαρός.

-ρι; in ἴδ-ρι-s *knowing*, ἄκ-ρι-s *mountain-top*.

-ρυ, -λυ: δάκ-ρυ *tear*, θῆ-λυ-s *female* (θῆ-σθαι).

-τ: θής θη-τ-ός, νύξ νυκ-τ-ός; but chiefly in Compounds, as προ-βλήs, ἀ-γνώs.

-ετ, -ητ: Acc. ἀργ-έτ-α *white* (Π. 21. 127), also ἀργήτα (Π. 8. 133), Dat. ἀργέτι and ἀργήτι (Π. 11. 818), κέλ-ης, λέβ-ης.

-το; found with Stems—

(1) In the O-form, as κοῖ-το-ς, κοί-τη (κεῖ-μαι) *lair*, φόρ-το-ν *burden*, νόσ-το-ς *going, return* (νέομαι for νεο-ο-μαι), οἶ-τος (εἶ-μι) *course, fortune*, βροντή (βρέμ-ω) *thunder*.

(2) In the weak form, as στα-τό-ς *stalled*, δρα-τό-ς *flayed*; ἀκ-τή *beach*; δέκ-τη-ς *beggar*, παραι-βά-τη-ς.

For the use of -το to form Superlatives and Ordinal Numerals see §§ 121 and 130.

-τι, -σι; generally with the weak Stem, as φά-τι-ς *saying*, πίσ-τι-ς (for πιθ-τις) *trust*, τί-σι-ς *vengeance*, δόσις, βόσις, βρώσις, γένεσις, νέμεσις, ἄνυσις, ἄροσις.

-ση, as κλισίη *a tent*, ὑπο-σχέ-σθή *promise*.

-τινη in δω-τίνη (from δώ-τις) *gift*.

-τύ; βρω-τύ-ς *food*, κλι-τύ-ς *a slope*, μνησ-τύ-ς *wooing*, δαι-τύ-ς *feasting*, ἐδ-τύ-ς *eating*. This Suffix is especially common in Homer: ἀγορητύς, ἀλαωτύς, βοητύς, γραπτύς, ἐλεητύς, καθαριστύς, ἀκοντιστύς, δαριστύς, ὀρχηστούς, ὄτρυντύς, ῥυστακτύς, τανυστούς.

-τερ, in πατήρ, μήτηρ, θυγάτηρ, εἰνά-τερ-ες, γαστήρ, ἀστήρ.

-τηρ, -τορ, -τωρ; as δο-τήρ-α and δώ-τορ-α (Acc.) *giver*, βοτήρ-ες and βώτορες *herdsmen*, ἰστωρ *witness*, ἀφ-ήτωρ *shooter*, ἐπ-ακτήρ *'driver,' huntsman*, δι-οπτήρ *spy*, ληϊστήρ *spoiler*, κοσμήτωρ *arrayer*, μῆσ-τωρ-α (μῆθ-ομαι) *adviser*: also of *things*, with a touch of personification, κρητήρ, ζωστήρ, λαμπτήρ. Fem. -τειρα (-τερ-ῆ), as δμή-τειρα *subduer*.

-τρο-ο, as ἰη-τροός *healer*, ἄρο-τρο-ν *plough*, σκῆπ-τρον, λέκτρον.

-δ, -ιδ, -ῆδ; as Acc. ἐλπ-ιδ-α *hope*; λευκ-ᾶδ-α *white*.

-δο, -δη; κέλα-δο-ς *noise* (κέλ-ομαι), κομῆ-δη *tending*, κλά-δος *branch*, ὄμαδος, χρομάδος, ῥάβδος.

This Suffix is chiefly seen in the Adverbs in -δον, -δην, as σχε-δό-ν *near*, βά-δην *at a walk*, &c.: see § 110, and cp. the secondary forms στά-δ-ιος, &c. (§ 118).

The Suffixes -θ-ρο, -θ-λο, -θ-μο are produced by combining the Verbal suffix or Root-determinant -θ (§ 45) with -ρο, -λο, -μο: thus ὄλε-θ-ρος, γενέ-θ-λη, στα-θ-μός presuppose the Verbs *ὀλέ-θω, *γενέ-θω, *στά-θω (cp. ἐϋ-σταθ-ής, also στή-θος) formed like πλῆ-θω, φλεγέ-θω, μινύ-θω, &c. Practically, however, they are single Primary Suffixes: -θμο is especially common in Homer, cp. ἀρ-θμός, ἀρι-θμός, κηλη-θμός, ἔλκη-θμός, ὀρχη-θμός, κυνζη-θμός: λύ-θρον, ῥέε-θρα, μέλπη-θρα, μέλα-θρον, βέρε-θρον. Cp. also -θμα in ἱ-θμα-τα *going*.

Similarly from Verb-Stems with the suffix $-\tau$ we have $\lambda α ι - \tau - \mu α$ *gulf* (cp. $\lambda α ι - \mu ός$ *throat*), $α ὕ - \tau - μ ή$ *breath*, also $α ὕ - \tau - μ ή ν$ (root *av-*), $ἐρε - \tau - μ ός$ *oar*, $ἐφ - ε - \tau - μ ή$ *injunction*.

114*. Variation of Suffixes.

1. Primary Suffixes were originally liable to variation of the kind already noticed (§ 106). From the Sanscrit declension, in which the variation is preserved with singular fidelity, it appears that a Suffix in general has three different forms or degrees of quantity, called by Sanscrit grammarians the *strong*, the *middle*, and the *weakest* form. Just as in the declension of *dyāus*, Gr. *Ζεύς*, we find (1) *dyāu-* in the Nom., (2) *dyāv-* in the Loc. *dyāv-i* (Lat. *Jōvi* for *diēv-i*), and (3) *dīv-* or *diu-* in other Cases, so in *dā-tā* 'giver' we have (1) *-tār-* in the Acc. *dā-tār-am*, (2) *-tar-* in the Loc. *dā-tār-i*, and (3) *-tr-* in the Dat. *dā-tr-é*, Instrum. *dā-tr-ā*.

Similarly we have the series $-\bar{a}r$, $-\check{a}r$, $-r$; $-mān$, $-mān$, $-mn$; $-vān$, $-vān$, $-vn$; $-ān$, $-ān$, $-n$, &c.: the rule being that the first or strong form contains a long vowel, which in the second is short, and in the third disappears altogether.

In the combinations $-va$, $-ia$ the *a* is lost and the semivowel becomes a vowel, thus giving $-u$, $-i$.

2. In Greek we find the same Suffixes as in Sanscrit, with the further distinction that the vowel may be η or ω , ϵ or \omicron . Thus we may have $-\tau\omega\rho$, $-\top\omicron\rho$, $-\tau\eta\rho$, $-\tau\epsilon\rho$, $-\tau\rho$; $-\mu\omega\nu$, $-\mu\omicron\nu$, $-\mu\eta\nu$, $-\mu\epsilon\nu$, $-\mu\nu$ ($-\mu\check{\alpha}$, $-\mu\check{\alpha}\nu$); $-\omega\sigma$, $-\omicron\sigma$, $-\epsilon\sigma$; $-\phi\omega\sigma$, $-\phi\omicron\sigma$, $-\phi\epsilon\sigma$, $-\upsilon\sigma$; $-\iota\omega\sigma$, $-\iota\omicron\sigma$, $-\iota\epsilon\sigma$, $-\iota\sigma$; and so in other cases. Sometimes both sets of forms occur with the same root; as $\delta\acute{\omega}\tau\omega\rho$, $\delta\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\rho\text{-}\omicron\sigma$ and $\delta\omicron\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, $\delta\omicron\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\text{-}\omicron\sigma$.

The interchange of \omicron and ϵ in the Suffix $-\omicron$ (as $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\text{-}\omicron\sigma$, Voc. $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon$) belongs to this head.

The three forms of a Suffix are hardly ever to be seen in the Greek declension; one of them being usually taken as the Stem of all the oblique Cases. Thus the strong form is generalised in $\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\text{-}\tau\omega\rho$, $-\tau\omega\rho\text{-}\omicron\sigma$, the second in $\delta\acute{\omega}\text{-}\tau\omega\rho$, $-\top\omicron\rho\text{-}\omicron\sigma$, to the exclusion of the original $*\mu\eta\sigma\tau\rho\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\sigma$, $*\delta\omega\tau\rho\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\sigma$, &c. The 'weakest' form, however, often appears in derivatives; e.g. $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\nu$, $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\text{-}\omicron\sigma$, $\pi\omicron\lambda\mu\text{-}\eta$: $\delta\epsilon\lambda\mu\omega\nu$, $\delta\epsilon\lambda\mu\omicron\nu\text{-}\omicron\sigma$, $\delta\epsilon\mu\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega$ (for $-\mu\check{\alpha}\nu\text{-}\acute{\iota}\omega$, $-\mu\nu\text{-}\acute{\iota}\omega$): $\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\omega\nu$, Fem. $\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\text{-}\eta$, also $\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota\text{-}\nu\alpha$ (for $-\pi\nu\text{-}\acute{\iota}\alpha$): $\iota\eta\text{-}\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, $\iota\alpha\tau\rho\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\sigma$: $\upsilon\delta\omega\rho$, $\upsilon\delta\rho\text{-}\omicron\sigma$: $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\text{-}\mu\omega\rho$, $\tau\epsilon\kappa\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ (for $\tau\epsilon\kappa\mu\check{\alpha}\rho\text{-}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$), &c. Cp. Lat. *car*- \acute{o} (*n*), Gen. *car*-*n*-*is*.

3. The relation of the forms $-\omega\nu$ ($-\mu\omega\nu$, $-\phi\omega\nu$), $-\omega\rho$ ($-\tau\omega\rho$), &c. to $-\eta\nu$, $-\mu\eta\nu$, $-\phi\eta\nu$, $-\eta\rho$, $-\tau\eta\rho$, &c. has been the subject of much controversy. It is generally agreed that the difference is not original, but arises in each case by differentiation from a single

form. Probably it is due to shifting of accent, the Suffixes with η being generally accented, while those with ω are found in barytone words. Thus we have the pairs $\delta\omicron\tau\eta\rho$ and $\delta\acute{\omega}\tau\omega\rho$, $\rho\eta\tau\eta\rho$ and $\rho\acute{\eta}\tau\omega\rho$, $\beta\omicron\tau\eta\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ and $\beta\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\rho\epsilon\varsigma$, $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$ but $\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\rho$, also Lat. *sor-ōr* (Sanscr. *svāśā*). In composition, too, the loss of accent is regularly accompanied by the change from η , ϵ to ω , \omicron : $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$, $\mu\eta\tau\rho$ - $\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\rho$; $\delta\mu\eta\tau\eta\rho$, $\pi\alpha\nu$ - $\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\rho$; $\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho$, $\epsilon\upsilon$ - $\eta\nu\omega\rho$; $\phi\rho\eta\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\phi\rho\omega\nu$, &c. Many exceptions, however, remain unexplained.

4. The Nouns of Relationship (the group $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$ &c.) with one or two similarly inflected words ($\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\eta\rho$, $\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho$) are distinguished from the Nouns of the Agent in $-\tau\eta\rho$ ($-\tau\omega\rho$) by the use of the shorter form $-\tau\epsilon\rho$ in the Accusative: $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho$ - α , Sanscr. *pitār-am*, but $\delta\omicron\tau\eta\rho$ - α , Sanscr. *dātār-am*. Similarly among Stems in $-n$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\sigma\eta\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\sigma\epsilon\nu$ - α answer to Sanscr. *vśh-a*, *vśhan-am* (instead of $-\acute{\alpha}n-am$). This peculiarity has been explained as the result of an original difference of quantity. That is to say, the form *pitār* (Gr. $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho$ -) has been taken to be the *strong* Stem, because it is the Stem of the Acc. If so, the η of the Nom. has to be explained as due to the analogy of the $-\eta\rho$ of $\delta\omicron\tau\eta\rho$, &c. But this view cannot well be reconciled with the fact that the Stem *pitār*- occurs not only in the Acc. *pitāram* but also in the Loc. *pitār-i*. The Loc. is a Case which regularly takes the *middle* Stem; cp. *dātār-am*, Loc. *dātār-i*, *ácmān-am*, Loc. *ácmān-i*. Hence we must recognise a group of Stems in $-r$ and $-n$ forming the Acc. with the *middle* form. Thus the original declension would be (e.g.), Strong form, Nom. $\pi\alpha$ - $\tau\eta\rho$,—Middle form, Acc. $\pi\alpha$ - $\tau\epsilon\rho$ - α , Loc. $\pi\alpha$ - $\tau\epsilon\rho$ - i , Voc. $\pi\acute{\alpha}$ - $\tau\epsilon\rho$,—Weakest form, Gen. $\pi\alpha$ - $\tau\rho$ - $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. The cause of this difference in the treatment of the Accusative has still to be found*.

5. The Stems in $-ant$, $-mant$, $-vant$, (Gr. $-\omicron\nu\tau$, &c.) interchange with shorter forms in $-at$, $-mat$, $-vat$, Gr. $-\acute{\alpha}\tau$, $-\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau$, $-\acute{f}\acute{\alpha}\tau$. In Greek the Suffix $-\omicron\nu\tau$ is used to form the Part. Pres., as $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu\tau$ - α . The chief trace of $-\acute{\alpha}\tau$ is the Doric $\xi\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$ ($\xi\omicron\sigma$ - $\acute{\alpha}\tau$ - $\iota\alpha$) for $\xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$. The forms $-\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau$, $-\acute{f}\acute{\alpha}\tau$ are found in the Neuters, such as $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ - $\mu\alpha\tau$ - $\omicron\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, ($\pi\epsilon\rho$ - $\acute{f}\acute{\alpha}\tau$ - $\omicron\varsigma$), &c. So in Latin *nōmen*, *nōminis*, for *nō-mn-is* (Sanscr. *nā-mn-as*).

On the other hand some Stems in $-v$ take $-\nu\tau$ in the oblique Cases: $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$, $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu\tau$ - $\omicron\varsigma$, but Fem. $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\alpha$ (for $\lambda\epsilon$ - $\acute{f}\nu$ - $\iota\alpha$, cp. Lat. *leō*, *leōn-is*): $\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\omega\nu$, $-\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$, but $\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi$ - ν - η : $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\phi\rho\omega\nu$, Fem. $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\phi\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$ for $\pi\rho\phi\rho\alpha$ - $\tau\iota\acute{\alpha}$. Cp. § 107, 2.

6. The Suffix of the Pf. Part. Act. presents anomalies, both in Sanscrit and Greek, which are not yet satisfactorily explained. The Sanscr. $-\acute{v}\acute{a}m\acute{s}$, $-\acute{v}as$, $-\acute{u}s$ and Greek $-\acute{f}\omega\sigma$, $-\acute{f}\omicron\tau$, $-\acute{\upsilon}\sigma$ (in $-\acute{\upsilon}\iota\alpha$ for

* Collitz in *Bezz. Beitr.* x. 37 ff.

-ῥσ-ιᾶ) seem to represent the original gradation; but the τ of the Masc. and Neut. oblique cases is peculiar to Greek, as the nasal to Sanscrit. If we suppose a primitive declension (*e.g.*) *ῥιδ-ῥῶς*, Acc. *ῥιδ-ῥῶσ-α*, Gen. *ῥιδ-ῥῶσ-ος*, &c. this might become Acc. *ῥιδ-ῥῶσ-α*, Gen. *ῥιδ-ῥῶσ-ος*, &c. (by the same levelling which we have in *δῶ-τωρ*, Acc. *δῶ-τωρ-α*, Gen. *δῶ-τωρ-ος*), then Acc. *ῥιδ-ῥῶ-α*, Gen. *ῥιδ-ῥῶ-ος* &c. At this stage the endings -ῶτ-ος, -ῶτ-α &c. may have been introduced through analogy—perhaps of the Pres. Part. However this may be, this is one of several instances in Nominal Declension of τ creeping in to form a Stem for the oblique Cases.

7. A Suffix which originally was closely parallel to the -ῥῶς of the Pf. is to be seen in the -ῖων or -ῖων of the Comparative; Sanscr. -*yāvis*, -*yās*, (-*is*), Greek -ῖων, -ῖον, -ῖο (in -ῖο-τος). Here the ν, in spite of the Sanscr. nasal, is as difficult to explain as the τ of the Pf. However the older endings -ο-α, -ο-ες (for -οσ-α, -οσ-ες) are preserved in the Acc. Sing. Masc. and Nom. and Acc. Plur. Neut. (*ἀμείνω* for *ἀμειν-οσ-α*), and the Nom. Plur. (*ἀμείνους*, &c.). In the Latin -*ior*, -*ior-is*, &c. there is no trace of a nasal. We may compare the variation in *αἰών*, *κυκλών* (§ 107 *ad fin*)^{*}.

8. Heteroclite forms occur when different Suffixes are brought into a single declension. In particular—

(a) Suffixes ending in -ν interchange with Suffixes in -ρ. Thus we find *πίων*, Gen. *πίον-ος* *fat*, but Fem. *πέιρα* (*πῖ-φερ-ιᾶ*) and the Neut. Substantive *πίαρ* *fatness*. Also *χειμῶν*, but *χειμέρ-ιος*. (Cp. the Lat. *femur*, *femin-is*, and *jec-ur*, *jecin-or-is*, which is for an older *jecin-is*.)

(b) Similarly along with ἡῶς we have ἡέρ-ιος *at dawn*, and the Adv. ἡρι (Sanscr. *ushās* and *ushár*).

(c) Final τ is introduced in the Suffix; as in ἡπα-τ-ος (for ἡπν-τ-ος, cp. the Sanscr. *yakrt*, Gen. *yakn-as*, and the other

* The suffixes of the Pf. Part. Act. and the Comparative have lately been the subject of much controversy: see Brugmann, *K. Z.* xxiv. 79 ff., *Grundr.* §§ 135, 136, pp. 403, 417; Joh. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxvi. 341 ff., 378 ff., *Pluralb.* p. 157; Collitz, *Bezz. Beitr.* x. 25, 63. The chief difficulty lies in the nasal of the Sanscrit strong Cases. Such a gradation as -*vāns* (or -*vēns*), -*ves*, -*us*, or -*iōns*, -*ios* (or -*ies*), -*is*, is unexampled. Joh. Schmidt takes the nasalised forms (Sanscr. -*vāms*-, -*iāms*) as his point of departure, but has been unable to explain -*vas*, -*jas*, -*us*, -*is* to the satisfaction of other scholars. Those who assume a primitive -*vās*, -*iās* have hitherto been equally unsuccessful in accounting for Sanscr. -*vāms*, -*iāms* and Greek -ῖων. The explanation of the τ of -οτ-ος, &c. is also difficult, but there it is at least certain that it is of secondary origin. It is to be noted that the traces of -ῖοσ in the Comparative are confined to *strong* Cases, as Acc. Sing. -οσ-α, Nom. Plur. -οσ-ες. Hence the Gen. -ῖον-ος, Dat. -ῖον-ι, &c. perhaps did not take the place of *middle* forms -ῖοσ-ος, -ῖοσ-ι, but of the primitive weak forms (-ῖο-ος, -ῖο-ι?).

Neuters in -ᾶρ, -ωρ, Gen. -ᾶτ-ος, as *πεῖραρ*, -ᾶτος (for *περ-ᾶρ*, -*ῖν-τ-ος*): also in Neuters in -μᾶ, Gen. -μᾶτ-ος (for -*μν-τ-ος*).

(d) It is probable that the Neuters in -ωρ—viz. *ῥῥωρ*, *ἔλωρ*, *πέλωρ*, *ἑέλδωρ*, *τέκμωρ*, *νύκτωρ* (Acc. used adverbially)—were originally Collective or Abstract nouns (Joh. Schmidt, *Pluralb.* p. 193). On this view *ῥῥωρ* *waters* (Germ. *gewässer*) is properly a different word from the stem **ῥῥα* or **ῥῥαρ* which we infer from the oblique Cases: *τέκμωρ* is originally a Collective or Abstract from *τέκμαρ*: and similarly *ἔλωρ*, *ἑέλδωρ*, *πέλωρ*, *νύκτωρ* (cp. *νυκτερ-ίς*), which only occur in the Nom. Acc., are nouns formed like *χειμών* (*χείμα*), *αἰδώς* (*αἰδεσ-* in *αἰδέομαι*, *ἀν-αἰδής*), *γέλωρ* (*γελασ-* in *γελάω*), &c. When *ῥῥωρ*, &c. were brought into use as Nominatives answering to Neuter oblique Cases, they naturally followed these in respect of gender. Cp. § 110 (*ad fin.*).

115.] Accentuation. The accent is often connected with the form of the Suffix, and sometimes varies with the meaning. But the rules that can be given on this subject are only partial.

1. Stems in -ο are generally oxytone when they denote an agent, barytone when they denote the thing done; e.g. *φορό-s* *bearer*, but *φόρο-s* *that which is brought*; *ἀγό-s* *leader*, *ἄρωγό-s* *helper*, *σκοπ-ός* *watcher*, *τροφό-s* *nurse*, *τόκο-s* *offspring*. But *νομό-s* *pasture*, *λοιγό-s* *pestilence* (perhaps thought of as an agent, 'destroyer').

2. Stems in -η are generally oxytone, but there are many exceptions (as *δίκ-η*, *μάχ-η*).

3. Most stems in -ιδ, and all in -ᾶδ, are oxytone. But those which admit an Acc. in -ιν are all barytone.

4. Adjectives in -υ-s are oxytone; except *θῆλ-υ-s* and the isolated Fem. *θάλλεια*. Substantives in -υ-s are mostly oxytone; but see § 116, 4.

5. Neuters with Stems in -εσ (Nom. Acc. -ος) are barytone, but Adjectives in -ης, and Fem. Nouns in -ως, Gen. -οος, are oxytone.

6. Nouns in -ηρ and -ην are oxytone, except *μήτηρ*, *θυγάτηρ* (but see § 111, 2), *ἄρσην*, *τέρην*.

Nouns in -ωρ and -ων are mostly barytone, but there are many exceptions, esp. the Abstract Nouns in -δων, the Substantives in -μων, as *δαιτυμών*, *ἡγεμών*, *κηδεμών*, and most Nouns in -ων, Gen. -ωνος, as *ἄγών*, *ἄγκών*, *χειμών*, *τελαμών*.

7. Stems in -το with the O-form are barytone, with the weak form oxytone; e.g. *κοῖ-το-s*, *νόσ-το-s*, but *στα-τό-s*, &c.

8. Stems in -τη are mostly oxytone. Accordingly the Prim-

itive Masculines in *-τη-s*, which are Nouns of the Agent, can generally be distinguished from the Denominatives in *-της* (§ 117): *e.g.* ἀγορητής *a speaker*, but ναύτης *a ship-man*.

9. Abstract Nouns in *-τι*, *-σι* are barytone; in *-ῤ* oxytone.

It will be seen that, roughly speaking, when the Verbal Stem is in the weak form, the Suffix is accented, and *vice versâ*: also that words with an active meaning (applicable to a personal agent) are oxytone, those with a passive meaning (expressing the thing done) are barytone.

116.] Gender. The Gender of Nouns is determined in most cases by the Suffix. The following rules do not apply to Compounds, as to which see § 125.

1. Stems in *-ο* are Masc. or Neut., with some exceptions, as ὀδός, ἀταρπός, κέλευθος, νῆσος, φηγός, ἄμπελος, νόσος, ταφρός, ψήφος, σποδός, ψάμαθος, ῥάβδος, δοκός, ῥινός, πρό-χοος. In these the change of gender seems to be due to the meaning.

κλυτός is used as a Fem. in Il. 2. 742 κλυτὸς Ἴπποδάμεια. In Od. 4. 406 πικρὸν ἀποπνείουσαι . . ὀδμήν it is best to take πικρὸν as an adverb, not with ὀδμήν: cp. Il. 6. 182.

Πύλος has the two epithets ἡμαθόεις and ἡγαθέη, and is probably therefore of both Genders.

2. Stems in *-η* (for *-ā*) are mainly Fem.; but—

Stems in *-τη* denoting an agent are Masc., as δέκ-τη-s *a beggar*, αἰχμη-τή-s *a warrior*. Also, πόρκη-s *the ring of a spear*, ἔτη-s *comrade*, ταμίη-s *dispenser*, νεηνίη-s *a youth*, perhaps ἀγγελίη-s *a messenger*; also the proper names Βορέα-s, Ἑρμεία-s, Αἰνεία-s, Αὐγεία-s, Τειρεσία-s, Ἀγχίση-s, Ἀΐδη-s.

The Masc. Nouns in *-ās*, *-ης* are probably formed originally from Feminine abstract or collective Nouns in *-ā*, *-η*. The first step is the use of the word as a concrete: cp. Od. 22. 209 ὁμηλική δέ μοι ἔσσι *thou art one of the same age (ὁμηλιξ) with me*; Il. 12. 213 δῆμον ἕοντα *being one of the common people*. So in Latin *magistratus*, *potestas* (Juv. 10. 100), *optio*: English *a relation* (= *a relative*). The next step is the change to the Masc., which leads to the use of the Endings *-ης*, Gen. *-αιο* on the analogy of the Masc. *-ος*, Gen. *-οιο*. We may compare Fr. *un trompette bearer of a trumpet*, Italian *il podestà the magistrate*, where the change of meaning is marked by the gender only. So ἔτη-s is probably from a word σφέ-τη *kindred*, νεηνίη-s from a Fem. νεηνίη *youth*, ἀγγελίη-s (if the word exists, see Buttmann, *Lexil.* s. v.) from ἀγγελίη. The Masc. ταμίη-s may be formed from the concrete Fem. ταμίη, the office of household manager being generally filled by a woman (γύνη ταμίη Od.). And so the Nouns in *-της* owe their origin to the older abstract or collective Nouns in *-τη*, as ἀκ-τή, βροντή, ἀρε-τή, γενε-τή, πυν-τή, &c. See Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. pp. 7-13.

3. Stems in -ἰᾱ, -ἰδ, -ᾱδ are Fem.; also most Stems in -ι. But μάν-τι-s is Masc., and some Adjectives—ἰδ-ρι-s, τροφ-ι-s, εὐνι-s—are of all genders.

Masc. Nouns in -ο sometimes form a Fem. in -ι, -ιδ, -ᾱδ: as θούρο-s, Fem. θούρι-s (Acc. θούρι-ν, Gen. θούριδ-ος); φόρ-το-s *burden*, φόρ-τι-s (Gen. φόρτιδ-ος) *a ship of burden*; τόκ-ος, Fem. τοκάδ-ες; λευκό-s, Fem. λευκάδ-α (πέτρην).

Originally (as in Sanscrit) the chief Feminine Suffix was -ι. The metre shows that the long ι should be restored in ἦμι-s (βοῦν ἦνιν εὐρυμέτωπον Il. 10. 292, Od. 3. 382), βλοσυρῶπις (Il. 11. 36), and βοῶπις (Il. 18. 357, where Ven. A has βοῶπι πότνια Ἥρη). The ι appears also in ἀψιδ-ος, κνημίδ-ας, ἐὺπλοκαμίδ-ες.

4. Adjectives in -ῦ generally form the Fem. in -εῖᾱ or -εᾱ (for -εῖ-ἰᾱ), as ἡδέῖᾱ, ὠκέᾱ. But θήλυ-s as a Fem. is commoner than θήλεια; and we also find ἡδὺς αὐτμή (Od. 12. 369), πολὺν ἐφ' ὑγρῇν (Il. 10. 27).

On the other hand most Substantives in -υ-s are Fem. (and oxytone), and this υ is frequently long, as in ἰθύ-s *aim* (whereas the Adj. ἰθύ-s *straight* has ῖ), πληθύ-s *multitude*, ἰλύ-s *mud*, Ἐρινύ-s, and the Abstract Nouns in -τύ-s, as βρω-τύ-s, ὄρχησι-τύ-s, κλι-τύ-s. But there are a few Masc. Substantives in -υ-s, viz. θρήνυ-s, στάχυ-s, βότρυ-s, νέκυ-s, ἰχθύ-s.

5. The Suffix -εο is almost confined in Homer to Neut. Substantives of abstract meaning: the only clear example of an Adjective is ὑγίης (Il. 8. 524). For ἐλεγχέ-ες (Il. 4. 242., 24. 239) we should probably read ἐλέγχεα. In Il. 4. 235 (οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ ψευδέσσι πατὴρ Ζεὺς ἔσσει' ἄρωγός) we may equally well read ψεύδεσσι (*Zeus will not help falsehood*). The Gen. φραδέ-ος (Il. 24. 354) may come from φραδής or φραδύς.

It seems very probable that these words are to be accounted for in much the same way as the Masculines in -της, viz. as abstract turned into concrete Nouns by a simple change of gender. The transition to a concrete meaning may be observed in ψεύδος in such uses as Il. 9. 115 οὐ γὰρ ψεύδος ἐμὰς ἀτὰς κατέλεξας *not falsely* (lit. *not falsehood*) *hast thou related my folly*. So ἐλέγχεα *reproaches*!

6. Suffixes which are used to express an *abstract* or a *collective* meaning are generally Feminine; e. g. κακό-s *coward*, κάκη *cowardice*; ὁσίη *piety*; φύζα, φυγή *flight*; βουλή *counsel*, also the *body* of counsellors, a *council*; φρόνι-s *understanding*; νιφ-άς (-ᾱδ-ος) *a snow-storm*; πληθ-ύ-s *multitude* (collective and abstract); and the Nouns in -τις (-σις), -τους, -ως, -δων.

It is probable that all the Collective Nouns in -ων, -ως, -ωρ (§ 114, 8, d) were originally Feminine. The change of gender may be traced in αἰών (Fem. in Homer), and ἰδρώς (Fem. in Æolic). In the case of ἔρως, γέλως it may be connected with the confusion between -ωσ-stems and -ο-stems (§ 107 *ad fin.*). It is to be noted that no nouns in -μων form the Fem. with -ια.

Denominative Nouns.

117.] **Secondary Suffixes.** The following are the chief Secondary or 'Denominative' Suffixes. (Note that -ο and -η of the Primitive Stem disappear before Secondary Suffixes beginning with a vowel*.)

-ΙΟ, -ΙΗ; as δικά-ιο-s *just*, ἄρμον-ιη a *joining*, ἄρθμ-ιο-s *friendly*, αἰδοῖο-s (for αἰδοσ-ιο-s) *reverenced*, γελοῖο-s (probably to be written γελώ-ιο-s) *laughable*, ὥρ-ιο-s *in season*, σοφ-ιη *skill*, σκοπ-ιη *watch*, ἀναγκα-ιη *necessity*.

-ΕΙΟ, -ΕΟ (chiefly used to denote *material*, especially the *animal* which furnishes the material of a thing); e.g. ἵππ-ειο-s, ταύρ-ειο-s, αἶγ-ειο-s, βό-ειο-s and βό-εο-s, κυν-ιη, χάλκ-ειο-s and χάλκ-εο-s, κυάν-εο-s, δουράτ-εο-s, φλόγ-εο-s, ἡγάθ-εο-s (from ἀγαθό-s), δαιδάλ-εο-s, &c. These must be distinguished from the Adjectives in which ειο stands for εσ-ιο, as τέλειο-s (for τελεσ-ιο-s), δνειδειο-s, Ἀργεῖο-s.

-ΕΥ; ἵππ-εύ-s *horseman*, ἀριστ-εύ-s *one who does best*, χαλκ-εύ-s, ἱερ-εύ-s, νομ-εύ-s, Σμινθ-εύ-s, &c.—all from Nouns in -ο.

-ΙΔΗ, -ΙΑΔΗ; in patronymics, as Ἀτρε-ίδη-s, Πηλη-ϊάδη-s, Ἀσκληπι-άδη-s. Cp. the compound -ιδ-ιος (§ 118).

-ΡΟ, -ΕΡΟ; as λιγυ-ρό-s *shrill*, δυοφ-ερός *dark*; μέγα-ρο-v.

-ΪΜΟ; αἰοῖδ-ιμο-s *matter of song*, μόρ-ιμο-s *fated*, &c.

-ΝΟ, -ΙΝΟ; as φαεινός (φαεσ-) *shining*, ἔρεβεννός (ἐρεβεσ-) *dark*, ἐραυνός *lovely*; φήγ-ινο-s *oaken*, εἰαρ-ινός *of spring*, &c.

-ΙΝΟ; ὀπωρ-ινός *of autumn*, ἀγχιστ-ῖνος.

-ΗΝΟ; πετε-ηνός *flying* (πετ-εσ-).

-ΣΥΝΟ, -ΣΥΝΗ; γηθό-συνο-s *joyful*; ἵππο-σύνη *horsemanship*, &c.

-ΕΝΤ (for -Fεντ), Fem. -εσσῆ; ὕλῃ-εντ-α, Fem. ὕλῃ-εσσ-α *wooded*, δινῇ-εντ-α *full of eddies*, λειριό-εντ-α *like the lily*, &c.

-ΙΚΟ; only found in ὀρφαν-ικό-s *orphan*, παρθεν-ική *virgin*, and a few Adjectives from proper names, as Τρω-ικό-s, Ἀχαι-ικό-s, Πελασγ-ικό-s. In these words it is evident that there is no approach to the later meaning of the Suffix.

* This is probably not the result of an 'elision' but analogous to the weakening of a Suffix (cp. § 114, 1). Thus the Stem of σοφό-s, Voc. σοφέ, is related to the form σοφ- (in σοφ-ιη) as πάτερ to πατρ- in πατρ-ός, πάτρ-ιος (Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 59, p. 102).

-τη; ναύ-τη-s, ιππό-τα, τοξό-τα (Voc.), ἀγρό-ται, αἰχμη-τή-s, κορυνή-τη-s, ὑπηνή-τη-s, πολιή-τη-s and πολλί-τη-s, ὀδί-τη-s. Some of these are perhaps Primitive: e. g. αἰχμη-τή-s may come from an obsolete *αἰχμάω *to wield the spear*: see § 120.

-τητ; φιλό-τητ-α *love*, δηϊο-τήτ-α *battle*.

-ιγγ; φόρμιγγ *a lyre*, σύριγγ *a reed-pipe*, σάλπιγγ *a trumpet*, λάιγγ-ες *pebbles*, στροφάλιγγ *eddy*, ραθάμιγγ-ες *drops*.

The ι of -ιδη, -ιμο, -ινο, -ικο was probably not part of the original Suffix, but was the final vowel of the Stem. We may either suppose (e. g.) that μόρ-ι-μος was formed directly from a Stem μορ-ι (cp. μοῖρα for μορ-ιᾶ), or that it followed the analogy of ἄλκι-μος, φύξι-μος, &c. Cp. the account given in § 109 of the ᾶ of -akis. It is remarkable that ο, which is regular as a 'connecting vowel' of Compounds, is extremely rare before Suffixes (except -τη, -τητ, -συνο).

Note that the -εῖ- of the Patronymics Ἀτρε-ίδης, Πηλε-ίδης, &c. does not become a diphthong in Homer.

Of the use of Secondary Suffixes to form *Diminutives* there is no trace in Homer. It may be noted here as another difference between Homeric and later Greek that the Verbals in -τέος are entirely post-Homeric.

118.] Compound Suffixes. There are some remarkable instances in Homer of a Secondary amalgamating with a Primary Suffix. E. g.—

-ἄλ-εο; ἄζ-αλέο-s *dry*, ἀργ-αλέο-s (for ἀλγ-αλέο-s) *painful*, θαρσ-αλέο-s, καρφ-αλέο-s, κερδ-αλέο-s, λευγ-αλέο-s, μυδ-αλέο-s, ῥωγ-αλέο-s, σμερδ-αλέο-s. It is used as a Secondary Suffix in λεπτ-αλέο-s *thin*, ὀπτ-αλέο-s *roast*.

-ἄλ-ιμο; κῦδ-άλιμο-s *glorious*, καρπ-άλιμο-s *swift*, πευκ-άλιμο-s *shrewd*.

-εινο (for -εσ-ινο or -εσ-νο); φα-εινός-s *shining*, αἰπ-εινός-s *lofty*, ἄλγ-εινός-s *painful*; Secondary in ἐρατ-εινός-s, κελαδ-εινός-s, ποθ-εινός-s. This Suffix takes the form -εννο in ἀργ-εννός-s *shining* and ἔρεβ-εννός-s *murky*.

-δ-ιο, -ιδ-ιο, -αδ-ιο: στά-διο-s, ἀμφά-διος, σχε-δλή (σχε-δόν-ν), παν-συ-δής; also as a Secondary Suffix in κουρῖδιος, μαψ-ιδίως, ῥή-ιδιος, ἐπινεφρ-ίδιον: κρυπτ-άδιος, διχθ-άδιος, μινυθ-άδιος.

-δ-ον, in τηκε-δόν-ι (Dat.) *wasting*, ἀηδών *nightingale*: -δωνη in μελε-δῶναι *cares*.

-δ-ἄνο, in ῥιγε-δανός *horrible*, ἡπεδανός, πευκεδανός, οὐτιδανός.

118*.] Suffixes of different Periods. In the great variety of Suffixes discovered by the analysis of the Greek Noun it is important to distinguish those which are 'living' in the period of

the language with which we are concerned, and those which only survive in words handed from an earlier period. Thus in Homer the oldest and simplest Suffixes, as -ο, -ι, -υ, -εσ, -ασ, -εν, -επ, -φο, evidently belong to the latter class. They are no longer capable of being used to form new words, because they are no longer separable in meaning from the Stems to which they are attached. On the other hand the Nouns in -μο-s, -μων, -μα, -τηρ, -τρο-ν, -σι-s, -τυ-s, and the Denominatives in -ιο-s, -ερο-s, -ινο-s, -τη-s, &c. are felt as derivatives, and consequently their number can be indefinitely increased by new coinage. Again the use of a Suffix may be restricted to some purpose which represents only part of its original usage. Thus -τη ceased, as we have seen, to form abstract Nouns, but was largely used to form Masculine Nouns of the Agent. So too the Suffix -δο, -δη survived in two isolated uses, (1) in Adverbs in -δο-ν, -δη-ν and (2) in Patronymics. Compare in Latin the older use of -tus in the adjectives *cautus*, *certus*, &c. with the living use in *amā-tus*, &c. Sometimes too a Suffix dies out in its original form, but enters into some combination which remains in vigour. Thus -νο survives in the form -ινο, and in -ενο (-εσ-νο).

The distinction of Primary and Secondary Suffixes is evidently one which grew up by degrees, as the several forms came to be limited to different uses. In this limitation and assignment of functions it is probable that the original meaning of the Suffix seldom had any direct influence*. The difference between the Suffixes of the two great classes is mainly one of *period*. The elements which go to form them are ultimately much the same, but the Primary Suffixes represent on the whole earlier *strata* of formation.

119.] **Gender.** The rules previously given (§ 116) apply to Denominative Nouns; the exceptions are few. Note II. 18. 222 ὅπα χάλκεον (*χαλκήν* Zenod.), 19. 88 ἄγριον ἄτην (the passage is probably corrupt, since it appears that the Homeric form of ἄτη is the uncontracted ἀάτη, ἀφάτη), 20. 299 (= Od. 5. 410) ἄλδς πολιοῖο, Od. 3. 82 πρῆξις . . δήμιος, 4. 442 δλοώτατος ὀδμή, 23. 233 ἀσπασίος γῆ (al. ἀσπασίως).

The origin of the Masc. patronymics in -δη-s may be explained in the same way as the Nouns of the Agent in -τη-s (§ 116, 2). We may suppose them to be derived from a group of Collective Nouns in -δη: e.g. Ἀτρεΐδη meaning the *family* of *Atreus*, Ἀτρεΐδη-s would mean one of the Ἀτρεΐδῃ †.

* On this point see Brugmann (*Grundr.* ii. § 57, p. 99). It will be seen that he gives no countenance to the view (which has been put forward in Germany and elsewhere) that the Suffixes were originally without meaning.

† It may be conjectured that the epithets in -ων, such as Κρονίων, Ἐπειών,

120.] Denominative Verbs. Some apparent anomalies in the Denominative Verbs may be explained by the loss of an intermediate step of formation. Thus, there are many Verbs in *-εω* not formed from Nouns in *-ευ-s*, as *βουλεύω* (*βουλ-ή*), *ἀγορεύω* (*ἀγορή*), *θηρεύω* (*θήρ*); so that, instead of the three stages—

νομό-s, Denom. Noun *νομ-εύ-s*, Denom. Verb *νομ-εύ-ω*

ἄριστο-s, „ „ *ἄριστ-εύ-s* „ „ *ἄριστ-εύ-ω*

the language goes directly from any Noun to a Verb in *-εω*.

Again, the Verbs in *-ιω* (§ 60) presuppose Nouns in *-ιη*, which are seldom found in use: *δηριό-μαι* (cp. *δῆρι-s* from which an intermediate *δηρί-η* might be formed), *μητιάω* (cp. *μήτι-s*), *κυδιόων*, *ἀοιδιάουσα*, *ἐδριόωντο*, *μειδιόων*, *θαλπιόων*, *φυσιόωντες*, *φαληριόωντα*, *ἐψιάσθαι* (Od. 21. 429), *δειελίσας*.

Similarly, a Primitive Noun may appear to be Denominative because the Verb from which it is formed is wanting. *E.g.* if in the series—

ἀνί-η vexation, *ἀνι-ᾶω*, *ἀνι-η-ρό-s*

διζύ-s grief, *διζύ-ω*, *διζύ-ρό-s*

the Verb were passed over, we should appear to have a Denominative Noun in *-ρο-s*. Again, if the Primitive Noun in *-η* and the Verb in *-ω* were both wanting, we should practically have the Compound Suffix *-η-ρο*: and this accordingly is the case (*e.g.*) in *αἰψ-ηρό-s* (*αἰψα*) *swift*, *θυ-ηλή* (*θύ-ω*), *ὑψ-ηλό-s* (*ὑψι*), *φύξ-ηλι-s*.

In this way are formed the peculiar Homeric *-ωρη*, *-ωλη*, which are used virtually as Primary Suffixes (forming abstract Nouns); *ἐλπ-ωρή hope*, *θαλπ-ωρή comfort*, *ἄλεωρή* (*ἄλεφ*) *escape*, *τερπ-ωλή delight*, *φειδ-ωλή sparing*, *παυσ-ωλή ceasing*. Note that the difference between *-ωρη* and *-ωλη* is euphonic; *-ωρη* is found only when there is a preceding *λ* in the Stem.

The Verb-Stem in Denominative Verbs is not always the same as that of the Noun from which it is formed: in particular—

1. Verbs in *-εω*, *-ωω* lengthen the final *-o* of the Noun-Stem to *-η* and *-ω*; as *φόβο-s*, *ἐ-φόβη-σα*; *χόλο-s*, *ἐ-χόλω-σα*.

The ground of this peculiarity must be sought in the fact that the Denominative Verbs were originally confined (like the Tenth Class of Sanscrit) to the Present Tense and its Moods. Consequently the other Tenses, the Fut., the Aor., and the Pf., were formed not directly from the Noun, but from the Stem as it appeared in the Present Tense. Hence such forms as

Οὐρανίανες, are derived from Collectives in *-ων* (§ 116, 6). Thus from *οὐρανίαν* (Sing. Fem.) *the heavenly powers* we might have *οὐρανίανες heavenly ones*, and finally *οὐρανίαν* as a Sing. Masc. Cp. *φυγάς* originally 'a body of exiles,' then *φυγάδες* 'exiles,' then *φυγάς* 'an exile.' So in French, first *la gent* 'people,' then *les gens*, finally *un gens-d'armes*.

φοβή-σω, ἐ-φόβη-σα, πε-φόβη-μαι go back to a period when the Pres. was either φόβη-μι or φοβή-ω.

2. Verbs in -ίω form Tenses and derivative Nouns as if from a Verb-Stem in -δ; as ὑβρι-ς, ὑβρί-ζω, ὑβριστής (as if ὑβριδ-τη-ς, although there is no δ in the declension of ὑβρι-ς).

3. Verbs in -ίω from Nominal Stems in -ρο, -λο, -νο often suppress the final -ο, as καθαρό-ς, καθαίρω (for καθαρ-ιω); ποικίλο-ς, ποικίλλω (for ποικιλ-ιω), ποικίλ-ματα. So perhaps ἀπινύσσω from ἀπίνυτο-ς, and even ἐρέσσω from ἐρέτ-η-ς. We may compare the loss of -ο, -η before a Suffix such as -ιο: see § 117 (*foot-note*).

Comparatives and Superlatives.

121.] The Suffixes which express comparison—either between two sets of objects (Comparative) or between one and several others (Superlative)—are partly Primary, partly Secondary. Hence it is convenient to treat them apart from the Suffixes of which an account has been already given.

The Comparative Suffix -ιον is Primary: the Positive (where there is one) being a parallel formation from the same (Verbal) Root. The Homeric Comparatives of this class are:—

γλυκ-ίων (γλυκ-ύ-ς), αἰσχ-ιον (αἰσχ-ρό-ς), πάσων (for παχ-ίων, παχ-ύ-ς), βράσων (βραχ-ύ-ς), θάσων (ταχ-ύ-ς), κρείσων (for κρετ-ίων, κρατ-ύ-ς), κακ-ίων, ὑπολίζου-ες better written ὑπολείζουες, ὀλίγ-ο-ς), μείζων (μέγ-α-ς), μάλλον (μάλ-α), ἄσσον (ἄγχ-ι), ἐλάσων (ἐλαχ-ύς), ἥσων (ἥκα), χείρων and χερε-ίων, ἄρε-ίων (ἄρε-τή), κέρδ-ιον (κέρδ-ος), ῥίγ-ιον (ῥίγ-ος), κάλλ-ιον (κάλλ-ος), ἄλγ-ιον (ἄλγ-ος), πλε-ίων, μείων, φιλ-ίων, ἀμείνων, βέλτ-ιον, λω-ῖον, βραδίων (Hes.).

The Stem is properly in the strong form, as in κρείσων (but κρατ-ύς, κάρτ-ιστος); but it is assimilated to the Positive in πάσων, βράσων, γλυκίων. In θάσων, ἐλάσων the *ā* points to forms *θαγχ-ίων, *ἐλαγχ-ίων, in which the nasal of the original *θεγχ-ίων, *ἐλεγχ-ίων was retained, but the *ε* changed into *ᾱ*.

The Superlative -ιστο is used in the same way; we have:—

ἥδ-ιστο-ς (ἥδ-ύ-ς), ὤκ-ιστο-ς (ὤκ-ύ-ς), βάρδ-ιστο-ς (βραδ-ύ-ς), κῦδ-ιστο-ς (κῦδ-ος), κῆδ-ιστο-ς (κῆδ-ος), ἐχθ-ιστο-ς (ἐχθ-ρό-ς), ἐλέγχ-ιστο-ς (ἐλεγχ-ος), οἰκτ-ιστο-ς (οἰκτ-ο-ς), μήκ-ιστα (μῆκ-ος), βάθ-ιστο-ς (βαθ-ύ-ς), ῥή-ιστο-ς (ῥεία, for ῥή-ια), φέρ-ιστο-ς (φέρ-ω); also, answering to Comparatives given above, αἰσχ-ιστο-ς, πάχ-ιστο-ς, τάχ-ιστα, κάρτ-ιστο-ς, κάκ-ιστο-ς, μέγ-ιστο-ς, μάλ-ιστα, ἄγχ-ιστα, ἥκ-ιστο-ς, ἄρ-ιστο-ς, κέρδ-ιστο-ς, ῥίγ-ιστα, κάλλ-ιστο-ς, ἄλγ-ιστο-ς, πλε-ιστο-ς: finally the anomalous πρῶτ-ιστο-ς.

The Suffix -ιον has taken the place of -ιος (§ 107, 7); the 'weakest' form may be traced in -ισ-τος. The middle form -ιος

perhaps appears in the two Comparatives *πλέες* *more* (Il. II. 395, Acc. *πλέας* Il. 2. 129) and *χέρεια* *worse* (Acc. Sing. and Neut. Plur., also Dat. Sing. *χέρηι*, Nom. Plur. *χέρηες*). Original *πλέεες* (for *πλε-ιες-ες*) became *πλέες* by Hypphaeresis (§ 105, 4): and so *χέρεια* is for *χερε-ιες-α* *. The weakest form of *-ιον* would be *-ω*, which may be found in *πρίν* (cp. Lat. *pris-cus*), and the Attic *πλε-ῖν*. Evidently *πλεος* : *πλεις* : *πλε-ῖν* = *prios* : *pris* : *πρίν*.

Traces of a Comparative Suffix *-ερο* appear in *ἔν-εροι* *those beneath* (Lat. *inf-eru-s*, *sup-eru-s*).

The Suffix *-το* or *-ἄτο* is found in the Ordinals *τρί-το-s*, &c., and with the Superlative meaning in *ὑπ-ατο-s*, *νέ-ατο-s*, *πύμ-ατο-s*, *μέσσ-ατο-s*, *ἔσχ-ατο-s*, and *πρώτος* (for *πρό-ατο-s*); also combined with Ordinal Suffixes in the Homeric *τρί-τ-ατο-s*, *ἑβδόμ-ατο-s*, *ὀγδό-ατο-s*. The form *-ἄτο* is probably due to the analogy of the Ordinals *τέτρα-το-s*, *ἑνα-το-s*, *δέκα-το-s*, in which the *ἄ* is part of the Stem †.

A Suffix *-μο* may be recognised in *πρό-μο-s* *foremost man* (Lat. *inf-mu-s*, *sum-mu-s*, *pri-mu-s*, *ulti-mu-s*, *mini-mus*).

The common Suffixes *-τερο*, *-ἄτο* appear with a Verb-Stem in *φέρ-τερο-s*, *φέρ-τατο-s* (cp. *φέρ-ιστο-s*), *βέλ-τερο-s* (*βόλ-ομαι*), *φίλ-τερο-s*, *φίλ-τατο-s* (cp. *ἐ-φίλα-το* *loved*), *δεύ-τερο-s*, *δεύ-τατο-s* (*δεύ-ω* *to fail, to come short of* ‡). So *φαάν-τατος*, for *φαέν-τατος* (*φαείνω*). Otherwise they are used with Nominal Stems: as *πρεσβύ-τερο-s*, *βασιλεύ-τερο-s*, *μελάν-τερο-s*, *κύν-τατο-ν*, *μακάρ-τατο-s*, *ἀχαρίστερος* (*ἄ-χαριτ-τερος*): and Pronouns, as *ἡμέ-τερος*, *ὕμέ-τερος*, *πό-τερος*, *ἀμφό-τερος*, *ἐκά-τερος*, *ἕτερος* (for *ἄ-τερος*, *ἄ-one*, with assimilation to *έν*). Final *ο* of the Stem becomes *ω* when a long syllable is needed to give dactylic rhythm; as *κακώ-τερο-s*, *κακοξεινώ-τερο-s* §. In *ἀνιηρέσ-τερος* (Od. 2. 190) the Stem follows the analogy of *θυμ-ῆρες*, &c. In *χαριέσ-τερος* (for *χαριFüt-τερος*) there is the same assimilation as in the Dat. Pl. *χαρίεσσι* (§ 106, 3). In *μυχολ-τατο-s* *innermost* the Stem appears to be a Locative case-form; cp. *παροί-τεροι* *more forward*, and

* So G. Mahlow and J. Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxvi. 381. A different analysis is given by Collitz in *Bezz. Beitr.* ix. 66 and Brugmann (*Grundr.* ii. § 135, p. 402), who explain *πλέες* as *plē-is-es*, i. e. from the weakest form of the Stem. This view does not apply so well to *χέρεια*, since it leaves unexplained the divergence between it and the Superl. *χείρισ-τος*. It may be noticed as an argument for the supposition of Hypphaeresis that we do not find the Gen. *πλέος*, *χέρειος*, just as we do not find Hypphaeresis in the Gen. of Nouns in *-εος*, *-εης* (§ 105, 4). Cp. however, the absence of trace of a Gen. *ἀμείνο-ος* (§ 114, 7, foot-note).

† Ascoli in *Curt. Stud.* ix. p. 339 ff.

‡ This very probable etymology is given by Brugmann, *K. Z.* xxv. p. 298.

§ According to Brugmann the *ω* of *σοφώτερος*, &c. is not a metrical lengthening, but comes from the adverbs * *σοφῶ*, &c. (related to *σοφῶς* as *οὕτως* to *οὕτως*, § 110), like the later *κατώ-τερος* from *κάτω*, &c.

later forms like κατώ-τερο-s, ἀνώ-τατο-s, &c. ; so probably in παλαί-τερος and ὑπέρ-τερος. On the analogy of ὑπέρ-τερος we can explain ἐνέρ-τερος (cp. ὑπερ-θε : ἐνερ-θε, &c.). The form γεραί-τερος, again, may be suggested by παλαίτερος, through the relation γεραίός : παλαιός and the likeness of meaning (Meyer, *G. G.* p. 372). The words δεξι-τερός, ἀριστερός are formed like Comparatives, but are distinguished by their accent.

The Suffix -τερο is combined with the Suffix -ιον in ἀσσο-τέρω (Adv.) *nearer*, ἐπ-ασσύτεροι *drawing on*, χειρό-τερο-s and χερειό-τερο-s *worse*.

-τερο, -τάτο are combinations of -το (in τρί-το-s, &c.) with the Suffixes -ερο and -άτο respectively. The tendency to accumulate Suffixes of comparison is seen in ἐν-έρ-τερος (-τατος), ὑπ-έρ-τερος (-τατος), ἀσσο-τέρω, χειρό-τερος and χερειό-τερος ; τρί-τ-ατος, ἐβδό-μ-ατος, πρῶτ-ιστος ; Lat. -issimu-s (for -is-ti-mu-s), *mag-is-ter*, *min-is-ter*.

122.] Comparative and Superlative Meaning. The Stem is often that of a Substantive, as κύν-τερο-s *more like a dog*, βασιλεύ-τατο-s *most kingly* ; so that the Adjectival character is given by the Suffix.

The meaning is often, not that an object has more of a quality than some other object or set of objects, but that it has the quality *in contradistinction to objects which are without it*. Thus in πρό-τερο-s the meaning is not *more forward*, but *forward*, opposed to ὕσ-τερο-s *behind*. So ὑπέρ-τερο-s and ἐνέρ-τερο-s, δεξι-τερός-s, and ἀριστερός-s, δεύ-τερο-s, &c. The same thing appears in the Pronouns ἡμέ-τερο-s, ὑμέ-τερο-s, ἑ-τερο-s, πό-τερο-s, ἐκά-τερο-s, ἀμφό-τερο-s, &c. ; ἡμέ-τερο-s is not *more belonging to us*, but *belonging to us (not you)*. So in the Homeric Comparatives :—

ἀγρό-τερο-s of the country (opp. to the town).

ὄρέσ-τερο-s of the mountains (opp. to the valley).

θεώ-τεραι, opp. to καταίβαται ἀνθρώποισιν (Od. 13. 111).

θηλύ-τεραι *female* (opp. to male).

κουρό-τεροι }
ὀπλό-τεροι } *the class of youths.*

Cp. Il. 19. 63 Τρωσὶ τὸ κέρδιον *that is a gain to the Trojans (rather than to us)*. Hence the Comparative is sometimes used as a softened way of expressing the notion of the Positive : as Il. 19. 56 ἀρειον 'good rather than ill' ; Il. 1. 32 σαώτερος *safe* (as we speak of being 'on the safe side') : so θάσσον with an Imper. Hence too the idiomatic use of the double Comparative, Od. 1. 164 ἐλαφρότεροι πόδας εἶναι ἢ ἀφνειότεροι *to be light of foot rather than wealthy*.

Composition.

123.] It is a general law of Greek and the kindred languages

that while a Verb cannot be compounded with any prefix except a Preposition, a Nominal Stem may be compounded with any other Nominal Stem, the first or prefixed Stem serving to limit or qualify the notion expressed by the other.

The Homeric language contains very many Compounds formed by the simple placing together of two Nominal Stems: as *πολι-πορθο-s* *sacker of cities*, *ροδο-δάκτυλο-s* *rose-fingered*, *τελεσ-φόρο-s* *bringing to an end*, *βουλη-φόρο-s* *bringing counsel*, *ὑψ-αγόρη-s* *talking loftily*, *πρωθ-ήβη-s* (for *πρωτο-ήβη-s*) *in the prime of youth*, &c.

124.] Form of the Prefixed Stem. The instances which call for notice fall under the following heads:—

a. Stems in -ο, -η:—

The great number of Nominal Stems in -ο created a tendency (which was aided by the convenience of pronunciation) to put -ο in place of other Suffixes. Thus we have—

-ο for -η, as *ῥιλο-τόμο-s* *wood-cutter*, &c.*

-ο for -εσ, in *εἰρο-κόμο-s* *wool-dresser*, *μενο-εικής* *pleasing to the spirit*; and for -ᾶς, as *γηρο-κόμο-s* *tending old age*.

-μο for -μον, as *ἀκρό-θετο-v* *anvil-block*; and for -μά, as *αἰμο-φόρυκτο-s* *dabbled with blood*, *Κυμο-δόκη*, &c.

-ρο for -ρά, in *πατρο-κασίγνητός*, *μητρο-πάτωρ*, *ἀνδρο-φόνος*, and the like. In *ἀνδρά-ποδον* the short Stem (as in *ἀνδρά-σι*) is retained, but probably this form is due to the analogy of *τετράποδον*: slaves and cattle being thought of together as the two main kinds of property in early times (Brugm.).

-ο inserted after a consonant; *παῖδ-ο-φόνος* *child-slayer*, *ἄρ-ματ-ο-πηγός* *chariot-builder*, *ὑδατ-ο-τρεφής* *water-fed*, *ἐλε-ό-θρεπ-το-s* (*ἐλεσ-ο-*) *grown in a marsh*, *ἡερ-ο-φοῖτι-s* *flying in air*, *δουρο-δόκη* (*δορφ-ο-*) *spear-holder*, *κεραο-ξόο-s* (*κερασ-*) *worker in horn*. Sometimes the -ο is a real Suffix; e.g. in *δι-ο-γενής* (*διφ-ιο*) *Zeus-sprung* (= *δῖον γένος ἔχων*).

Stems in -η instead of -ο appear in *θαλαμη-πόλο-s* *attendant of a chamber*, *πυρη-φόρο-s* *bearing wheat*, *ἐλαφη-βόλο-s*, *ἐκατη-βόλο-s*, *κραναή-πεδο-s*, *ὑπερή-φανο-s*. We may suppose that there was a collateral Stem in -η (e.g. *θαλάμη* is found, but in a different sense from *θάλαμο-s* Od. 5. 432), or that the Compound follows the analogy of *βουλη-φόρο-s*, &c.

Fem. -ᾶ becomes either -ο, as *ἀελλό-πος* *storm-foot*; or -η, as *γαῖή-οχο-s* *earth-holder*, *μοιρη-γενής* *born by fate*.

* It is possible however that Feminine Nouns in -η were regarded as formed from Stems in -ο, the long vowel being of the nature of a Case-ending (§ 113). This is especially applicable to Adjectives: e.g. *ἀκρό-πολις* comes directly from Masc. *ἀκρο-s* (Brugm.).

The result of these changes is to make *o* the 'connecting vowel' in the great majority of Compounds. In later Greek this form prevails almost exclusively.

b. Stems in -ι:—

The Compounds which contain these stems are mostly of an archaic stamp: ἀργί-ποδ-ες *with swift* (or *white*) *feet*, ἀργι-όδοντ-ες *white-toothed*, ἀργι-κέραυνο-ς *with bright lightning*, τερπι-κέραυνο-ς *hurling thunderbolts* (τέρπω=τρέπω, Lat. *torqueo*), εἰλι-ποδ-ες *trailing (?) the feet* (of oxen), ἀλι-πλοο-ς *washed by the sea*, also ἀλι-αῆς, ἀλι-πόρφυρος, Ἀλί-αρτος, Ἀλί-ζωνοι, Ἄλι-θέρης (cp. ἀλι-εύς *fisherman*), αἰγί-βοτο-ς *fed on by goats*, αἰγί-λιψ *deserted by goats*, χαλί-φρων *of light mind*, δαί-φρων *warlike* (or *prudent*), ἀλεξι-κακο-ς *defender against ill*, λαθι-κηδής *forgetting care*, πυκι-μηδής *with shrewd counsel*, καλλι-γύναικ-α *with beautiful women* (cp. κάλλι-μος), κυδι-άνειρα *glorifying men* (cp. κυδι-ών); with the Proper Names, Αἰθί-οπ-ες, Πειρί-θοο-ς, Ἀλκί-νοο-ς, Ἀλκι-μέδων (cp. ἄν-αλκι-ς), and the words beginning with ἀρι- and ἐρι-.

The meaning of several of these words is very uncertain, owing to the merely ornamental and conventional way in which they are used in Homeric poetry. It seems to follow that they are survivals from an earlier period, one in which the number of Stems in -ι was probably greater than in Homeric times.

Loss of *o* may be recognised in ἀρτί-πος (= ἄρτιος τοὺς πόδας), ζεί-δωρος *grain giving* (ζεία), κραται-γύαλος *of strong pieces*, Δηί-φοβος, perhaps also μιαί-φόνος, Ἀλθαι-μένης, ταλαί-πωρος: cp. γεραί-τερος from γεραῖο-ς.

c. Stems in -σι:—

This group is mainly Homeric: ἐρυσί-πολι (Voc.) *deliverer of the city* (with v. l. ῥυσί-πολι Il. 6. 305), ἀερσί-ποδ-ες *lifting the feet* (i. e. with high action), πλήξ-ιππο-ς *smiter of horses*, λυσι-μελής *loosening the limbs* (of sleep), τανυσί-πτερο-ς, ταλασί-φρων, ἀεσί-φρων, ταμεί-χρος, φαεσί-μβροτο-ς, φνυσί-ζοος, φθισί-μβροτο-ς, τερψί-μβροτο-ς, Τερψι-χόρη (Hes.), ἐνοσί-χθων (ἐννοσί-γαιος, εἰνοσί-φυλλος, &c.), πηγασί-μαλλο-ς, ὤλεσί-καρπο-ς, ἀλφεσί-βοιος, ἑλκεσί-πεπλο-ς, φθισ-ήνωρ, πλησ-ίστιο-ς, ἐρυσ-άρματ-ες, ῥήξ-ήνωρ, γαμφ-ώνϋς; and Proper Names, Πρωτεσί-λαο-ς, Ἀρσί-νοο-ς, Δεισ-ήνωρ, Λύσ-ανδρος, Πεισ-ήνωρ, Πεισί-στρατο-ς, Ὀρσί-λοχο-ς, Ἀναβησί-νεως, Ἠσί-οδος (Hes.), &c.

There are a few Stems in -τι; βωτι-άνειρα *feeding men*, Καστι-άνειρα (cp. κε-κασ-μένος).

We may add the Hesiodic φερέσ-βιος *life-bearing*, and φερεσ-σακῆς *shield-bearing* with φερεσ- apparently for φερεσι-.

These Stems were originally the same as those of the abstract Nouns in -τι-ς, -σι-ς: cp. Τέρψι-χόρη, τερψί-μβροτος, &c. with

τέρψι-*s*, πλήξι-*ππος* with πλήξι-*s*. But in many cases new Stems have been formed under the influence of the sigmatic Aorist, with a difference of quantity, as in φῦσι-ζοο-*s* *life-giving* (φῦσι-*s*), λῦσι-μελής, φθισί-μβροτο-*s*. Compare also ταμεσί-χρως with τμήσι-*s*, Πεισί-στρατο-*s* with πίστι-*s*, &c.

The group of Compounds is also to be noticed for the distinctly *Verbal* or *participial* meaning given by the first part of the word; cp. the next group, and § 126.

d. Stems in -ε:—

These are nearly all Verbal, both in form and meaning: ἔλκε-χίτων-*es* *trailing the chiton*, μενε-δήιο-*s* *withstanding foemen* (so μενε-χάρμη-*s*, μενε-πόλεμο-*s*, Μενέ-λαο-*s*, Μενε-σθεύς, &c.): ἐχέ-θυμο-*s* *restraining passion*, ἐχέ-φρων *possessing judgment*, ἐχε-πυκές *carrying sharpness*, Ἐχέ-πωλο-*s*, Ἐχέ-νηος, Ἐχε-κλῆς; ἀγε-λείη *driving spoil*, ἀρχέ-κακο-*s* *beginning mischief*, ἀγχέ-μαχο-*s* *fighting close*, λεχε-ποίη *with beds of grass*: Ἀρχέ-λοχο-*s*, Φέρε-κλος, Μελέ-αγο-*s*; φερέ-οικος *carrying his house* (of the snail in Hes.), ἐγρε-κύδοιμος *stirring tumult*: also (if ε is elided) ψευδ-ἀγγελο-*s* *bringing false news*, αἰθ-οψ *fiery*, μισγ-ἀγκεια *the meeting-place of glens*, ἀλεξάνεμος *keeping off wind*, Ἀλέξ-ανδρος.

Stems in -σε; ἀκερσε-κόμη-*s* *with unshorn hair*, Περσε-φόνεια.

With the Stems in -ε may evidently be placed ταλα-, in ταλά-φρων *with enduring mind*, ταλα-εργό-*s* *enduring in work*, ταλαύριωος (for ταλα-φρινο-*s*) *bearing a shield of hide*, ταλα-πενθής *bearing sorrow*, ταλα-πείριος *bearing trial*; and τλη- in Τλη-πόλεμος &c.: also τανυ-, in τανύ-γλωσσος *with outstretched tongue, long-tongued*, τανύ-φυλλος *long-leaved*, τανυ-γλώχινες *long-notched* (arrows), and ἐρυ- in Ἐρύ-λαος, *defender of the host*.

e. Stems in -ν:—

ᾱ for η appears in ὀνομά-κλυτος *of famous name*, κυνά-μνια for κυα-μνια on the analogy of κύν-α.

f. Case-forms:—

Nom. Acc. in Numerals, as ἔν-δεκα, δυνά-δεκα.

The Dative is probably to be recognised in ἀρητ-φατο-*s* *slain in war* (and so Ἀρητ-θοο-*s*, Ἀρητ-λυκο-*s*), πυρι-ηκής *sharpened by fire* (πυρί-καυστο-*s*, Πυρι-φλεγέθων), διῷ-πετής *falling in the sky*; the Dat. Plur. in κηρσεσι-φόρητο-*s* *brought by the fates*, ὀρεσί-τροφο-*s* *nursed in mountains*, ἐγχεσί-μωρο-*s* *great with spears*, ἐντεσι-εργό-*s* *working in harness*, τειχεσι-πλήτα (Voc.) *drawing near to* (assailing) walls, Ναυσι-κάα, Μηδεσι-κάστη, Πασι-θέη, Χερσι-δάμας; a Locative form in χαμαι-εύνης *sleeping on the ground*, ὁδοι-πόρο-*s* *a wayfarer*, χοροί-τυπία *figuring in the dance*, Πυλοι-γενής *born at Pylos*, παλαι-φατο-*s* *of ancient fame*, and perhaps (to express manner) in ἰθαι-γενής *duly born*, ὀλοοί-τροχο-*s* *rolling*. Cp. ἔμ-πυρι-βήτης *made to stand over the fire*, i. e. a kettle.

This use of the Dative may have been suggested by the Stems in *-i* and *-σi*. Compounds such as *ἐλκεσί-πεπλος*, *ὤλεσί-καρπος*, *ἀλφεσί-βοιος*, containing forms which sounded like the Dat. Plur. of Stems in *-εσ*, may have served as types for the group *ἐγχεσί-μορος*, *τειχεσί-πλήτης*, *ὄρεσί-τροφος*, &c. in which the Dat. Plur. takes the place of the Stem. Cp. *Πρωτεσί-λαος*.

Conversely, *φερέσ-βιο-s* *life-bearing*, and *φερεσ-σακής* (Hes.) ought to be **φερεσί-βιο-s*, but have followed the type of *ὄρεσ-βιο-s*, *τελεσ-φόρο-s*, &c.

The forms *διτ-φιλο-s*, *ἀρητ-φιλο-s*, *ἀρηι-κτάμενο-s*, *δαϊ-κτάμενο-s*, *δοורי-κλυτό-s*, *δοורי-κλειτό-s*, *ναυσι-κλυτό-s*, should probably be written as separate words, *Διτ φίλος*, **Ἀρηι κτάμενος*, &c. As to *-κτάμενος* see § 125, 6 : as to *-κλυτός*, *-κλειτός*, cp. § 128.

The Genitive is very rare : *οὐδενόσ-ωρο-s* *not worth caring for*, *Ἑλλήσ-ποντος*.

The Accusative may be recognised in *δικασ-πόλο-s* *busied about suits* (*δίκαί*), *ἀταλά-φρων* *with childish thought* (= *ἀταλά φρονέων*, which is also used in Homer), *ἀκαλα-ρρείτης* *gently flowing*, **Ἀλκά-θοος* (cp. Dat. *ἄλκ-ι*), *ποδά-νιπτρον*, also *πάν-* (*altogether*) in *πάμπαν*, *παν-αίολος*, *παν-άποτος*, *πάμπρωτος*, &c.

An ending *-η* (for *-ā*) may be seen in *νεή-φατος* *new-slain*, *ὀλιγη-πελέων*. This is perhaps an Instrum., as *πάντη* (§ 110).

125.] Form of the second Stem. 1. The use of a Root-Noun, *i. e.* a Verbal Stem without a distinct Nominal Suffix (§ 113), is more common in Composition than in simple Nouns : as, *δί-ζυγ-ες* *yoked in a pair*, *δί-πλακ-α* *two-fold*, *χέρ-νιβ-α* *hand-washing*, *οἶν-οπ-α* *wine-like*, *νήϊδα* (*νή-Φιδ-α*) *ignorant*, *αἰγί-λιπ-ος* (Gen.) *left by goats*, *πολυ-ᾤξ* *much starting*, *βου-ονλήξ* *an ox-whip*. The Stem, it will be seen, is in the Weak form.

2. Nouns in *-ώς* (Gen. *-ο-ος*) and in *-ος* (Gen. *-ε-ος*) form the Compound in *-ης*, Neut. *-ες*, as *ἀν-αιδής* *without shame* (*αἰδώς*), *θυμ-αλής* *grieving the spirit* (*ἄλγος*).

The Stem in these Compounds is often weak, though in the simple Neuters in *-ος* it is strong (§ 114) : *e. g.* *αἶνο-παθής* (as well as *ταλα-πενθής*, *νη-πενθής*, from *πένθος*), *ἀγχι-βαθής* (*βένθος*), *πολυ-βενθής*, *οἶνο-βαρής*, *πρωτο-παγής*, *ἀ-σινής*, *θυμο-δακής*, *ἀρι-φραδής*, *ἑτερ-αλκής*, *τηλε-φανής*, &c. So we find *ἄικώς* (Il. 22. 336) as Adv. to *αἰκής*, and *ἄλλο-ὔδεα* (Od. 13. 194) alongside of *θεο-ειδής*, *μυλο-ειδής*, &c.

This weakening of the Stem, accompanied by shifting of the accent to the suffix, apparently represents the original rule—words like *ταλα-πενθής* being formed afresh from the Simple Noun. Conversely, the analogy of the Compounds has given rise to the forms *πάθος*, *βάθος*, *βάρος*, &c. and also to the simple Adjectives such as *ψευδής*, *σαφής*.

3. Stems in *ην* (*εν-*) usually take *ων* (*ον-*) in Composition : as *φρήν* (Gen. *φρεν-ός*) forms *πρό-φρων*, Gen. *πρό-φρον-ος* : and

Neuters in -μα form Compounds in -μων, Gen. -μον-ος, as ἀν-αἷμον-ες (αἷμα) *bloodless*. Cp. ἀπείρων *boundless* (πείραρ, περαινω). So too πατήρ, μήτηρ, ἀνήρ, &c. form -ωρ (Gen. -ορ-ος), as μητρο-πάτωρ, εὐ-ήνωρ.

4. Some Stems take a final -τ, as ἀ-βλή-τ-α (Acc. Sing.) *un-thrown*, ἀ-κμῆ-τ-ες *unwearied*; so ἐπι-βλής, ἀ-δμής, ἀ-γνώς.

5. In Adjectives the Suffix is often replaced by one ending in -ο; as ὁ-πατρο-ς of *one father*, βαρβαρό-φωνο-ς *with strange voice* (from φώνη), χρυσο-ηλάκατο-ς *with golden distaff* (ἡλακάτη), δυσ-ώνυμο-ς of *evil name* (ὄνομα), ἀ-σπερμο-ς *without seed* (σπέρμα), &c. In other cases the Suffix is retained, and thus we find in Compounds (contrary to the general rules of Noun-formation)—

Masc. Stems in -η, as ἀργυρο-δίνη-ς,
and -ιδ, as λευκ-άσπιδ-ες.

Masc. and Fem. Stems in -ες, as μελι-ηδής *honey-sweet*, ἡρι-γένεια (for -ες-ῆ) *early born*.

Fem. Stems in -ο, as χρυσό-θρονο-ς ("Ἡρη), ῥοδο-δάκτυλο-ς (Ἡώς), and many other adjectives 'of two terminations.'

A Masc. Stem in -ματ, viz. ἐρυσ-άρματ-ες (ἵπποι).

6. The use of a Participle in the second part is rare: it is found in some Proper Names, as Οὐκ-αλέγων, Πυρι-φλεγέθων, Θεο-κλύμενος: also where it is a mere Adjective without any Tense-meaning, as πολύ-τλας, cp. ἀ-δάμας. In other cases we can write the words separately, as πάλιν πλαγχθέντας, δάκρυ χέων, πᾶσι μέλουσα, κάρη κομόωντες, εὖ ναιετάων, εὐρὺ ῥέων, ἐν κτίμενος, πάλιν ὄρμενος, Ἀρηί κτάμενος, δαί κτάμενος, &c.

7. Abstract Primitive Nouns are not used in the second part: thus we do not find ἐπεσ-βολή, but ἐπεσ-βολή (through a concrete ἐπεσ-βόλο-ς): and so βο-ηλασίη (not βο-ήλασι-ς), ἀνδρο-κτασί-η, εὐ-δικ-ίη, ἄμα-τροχίη, ἀλαο-σκοπιή. Except after Prepositions; as ἀμφί-βασι-ς, ἐπί-κλησι-ς, προ-χοή, προ-δοκή.

Note however παλιώσις (for παλι-ιώσι-ς), βου-λυτός *the time of unyoking*, βού-βρωστι-ς.

8. When the latter part of a Compound is derived from a disyllabic Verbal Stem beginning with a vowel, its initial vowel is often lengthened: as—

ἐλα- *drive*, ἵππ-ηλάτα, ἐξ-ήλα-τος, βο-ηλα-σίη.

ἐρα- *love*, ἐπ-ήρα-τος, πολυ-ήρα-τος.

ἄμελγ- *milk*, ἀν-ήμελκτος, ἵππ-ημολγοί.

ἀρό-ω *plough*, ἀν-ήρο-τος.

ἀλέγ-ω *care*, δυσ-ηλεγ-έος (Gen.), ἀπ-ηλεγ-έως.

ἐρέφ-ω *cover*, κατ-ηρεφ-ής, ἀμφ-ηρεφ-ής, ὑπ-ωρόφ-ιος.

ἀμείβ-ω *change*, ἐξ-ημοιβ-ός.

ἔρετ- *row*, φιλ-ήρετ-μος, δολιχ-ήρετμος.

ἐνεκ- *carry*, δι-ηνεκ-ής, ποδ-ηνεκ-ής, δουρ-ηνεκ-ής.

ἐλυ(θ)- *come*, νε-ήλυδ-ες.

ἀγερ- *assemble*, ὁμ-ηγερ-έες, θυμ-ηγερ-έων (= θυμὸν ἀγείρων).

ἐριδ- *strive*, ἀμφ-ήριστος *striven about*.

So ποδ-ήμεος, εὐ-ώνυμος (πολυ-ώνυμος, &c.), εὐ-ήνωρ (ἀνερ-), εὐ-ηφενής (from ἀφενος *wealth*), γαμψ-ώνυξ, πεμπ-ώβολον, ἀν-ήκεστος, ἀν-ώϊστος, ἐρι-ούνης (ὄνα- *help*), ὑπ-ώρεια (ὄρος), δι-ηκόσιοι and τρι-ηκόσιοι (ἐκατόν).

Similar lengthening is found, but less frequently, in the first part of the Compound; ὠλεσί-καρπος, ἡλιτό-μηνος, Ὠρεί-θνια. Also in other derivatives, as ἡμεμό-εις, ἡνορ-έη, τηλεθόωσα (θᾶλέθω), ἡγερέθονται (ἀγερ-).

126.] Meaning of Compounds. The general rule is that the prefixed Stem limits or qualifies the meaning of the other: as ὦμο-γέρον *hale old man*, δημο-γέρον *elder of the people*, τρι-γέρον (Aesch.) *thrice aged*; ἵππό-δαμο-ς *tamer of horses*, ἵππό-βοτο-ς *pastured by horses*, ἵππό-κομος *with plume of horse-hair*, ἵππο-κέλευθος *making way with horses*; βαθυ-δινήεις *deep-eddying*.

The prefixed Stem may evidently express very different relations—that of an Adjective, as ὦμο-γέρον, βαθυ-δίνης, or a Genitive, as δημο-γέρον, ἵππό-κομος, or an Object, as ἵππό-δαμος, or an Adverb of manner or place or instrument, as ὁμ-ηγερέες, ἡερο-φοίτης, &c.—and various attempts have been made to classify Compounds according to these relations. Such attempts are usually unsatisfactory unless the differences of meaning upon which they are based are accompanied by differences of grammatical form.

In respect of form an important distinction is made by the fact that in the second part of many Compounds a Substantive acquires the meaning of an Adjective without the use of a new Suffix; e.g. ῥοδο-δάκτυλο-ς, literally *rose-finger*, means not a *rosy finger*, but *having rosy fingers*; so ἵππό-κομος *with a horse-plume*, ἵππο-χαίτη-ς *with horse's mane (as a plume)*, βαθυ-δίνη-ς (= βαθυ-δινή-εις), &c. Such Compounds are called by Curtius *Attributive*. The formation is analogous to the turning of abstract into concrete Nouns by a mere change of Gender (instead of a Suffix), § 116. Thus διο-γενής (= δῖον γένος ἔχων) is to δῖον γένος as ψευδής *false* to ψεῦδος *falsehood*.

Among the meanings which may be conveyed by a Stem in a Compound, note the poetical use to express *comparison*: as ἀελλό-πος *storm-foot*, i. e. *with feet (swift) as the storm*, μελι-γερυ-ς *honey-voiced*, ῥοδο-δάκτυλο-ς, κυν-ῶπι-ς, &c. So too ποδ-ήμεος *like the wind in feet*, θυμο-λέων *like a lion in spirit*.

The order of the two Stems may be almost indifferent; i. e. it may be indifferent which of the two notions is treated as qualifying the other; e.g. ποδ-ώκης *swift of foot* (= ὥκως τοὺς πόδας)

is the same in practical effect as ὠκύ-πους *swift-foot*, with *swift feet* (ὠκεῖς πόδας ἔχων).

In the Compounds called by Curtius *Objective*, i. e. where the relation between the two parts is that of governing and governed word, the general rule requires that the governed word should come first, as in ἵππό-δαμο-ς *horse-taming*. This order appears to be reversed in certain cases in which the first Stem has the force of a Verb. The Stems so used are—

1. Stems in -ε (§ 124, d), as ἔλκε-χίτωνες, ἔχέ-φρων, &c.
2. Stems in -σι (§ 124, c), as ἔλκε-στί-πεπλος, φθι-σ-ήνωρ, &c.
3. Some of the Stems in -ι, as εἰλί-ποδες, κυδι-άνειρα, ἁμαρτί-νοος (Hes.), λαθι-κηδής, λαθί-φρων, τερπι-κέραννος (§ 124, b); and in -ο, as φιλο-πόλεμος *loving war*, φιλο-κέρταμος, φιλο-κτέανος, φυγο-πόλεμος *flying from war*, ἁμαρτο-επής *blundering in speech*, ἡλιτό-μηνος *astray as to the month*: also the Compounds of ταλα-, τλη-, as ταλα-πενυθής *enduring sorrow*, Τλη-πόλεμος, &c., and ταυ-, as ταυύ-πτερος (Hes.), which is = the Homeric ταυυσι-πτερος.

In most of these cases the inversion is only apparent. For instance, ἔλκεσι-πεπλος means *trailing the robe* as distinguished from other ways of wearing it; the notion of trailing is therefore the limiting one. So ταυυσι-πτερος means *long-winged*; μενε-πόλεμος, φυγο-πόλεμος, Τλη-πόλεμος, Νεο-πόλεμος describe varieties of the genus 'warrior.'

Nevertheless we must recognise a considerable number of Compounds in which the Prefixed Stem is Verbal in form as well as in meaning. A similar group has been formed in English (e. g. *catch-penny*, *make-shift*, *do-nothing*, &c.), and in the Romance languages (French *vau-rien*, *croque-mitaine*, Italian *fa-tutto*, &c.). These groups are of relatively late formation, and confined for the most part to colloquial language. The corresponding Greek forms represent a new departure of the same kind.

The process by which the second part of a Compound passes into a *Suffix* cannot often be traced in Greek. An example may be found in -απο-ς (ποδ-απός, ἡμεδ-απός, ἀλλοδ-απός), = Sanscr. -añc, Lat. -inquu-s (*long-inquus*, *prop-inquus*). In the adjectives in -οψ, as οἶνοψ, αἰθοψ, ἡνοψ, νῶροψ, μέροψ, the original sense of the Stem -οπ is evidently very faint. In the proper names Αἰθιοπες, Δόλοπες, Ἑλλοπες, Πέλοψ, &c. it becomes a mere Suffix.

127.] **Stems compounded with Prepositions.** These are of two readily distinguishable kinds:—

1. The Preposition qualifies; as ἐπι-μάρτυρος *witness to (something)*, περι-κτίον-ες *dwellers around*, ἀμφι-φαλο-ς *with crest on both sides*, πρό-φρων *with forward mind*. Forms of this kind are

sometimes obtained directly from Compound Verbs: *e.g.* ἔξοχος from ἐξ-έχω, not from ἐξ and ὄχος.

2. The Preposition governs, *i.e.* the Compound is equivalent to a Preposition governing a Noun; ἐν-νύχ-ιο-s *in the night*, κατα-χθόν-ιο-s *under-ground*, ἀπο-θύμ-ιο-s *displeasing* (lit. *away from the mind*), &c.; also (but less commonly) without a Secondary Suffix, as ἐγ-κέφαλο-s *brain* (lit. *within the head*), ἐπ-άρουρο-s *attached to the soil*.

The placing of the Preposition before the *governed* Stem is a departure from the general rule stated above. It may be held, however, that the Preposition serves (in some of these Compounds at least) as the limiting or qualifying member of the word. Compare νύχ-ιο-s *by night*, ἐν-νύχ-ιο-s *within the night*: it is evident that the ἐν limits the sense of νύχιος in essentially the same way as παν- in παν-νύχ-ιο-s *all the night*. So κατα-χθόν-ιο-s is nearly equivalent to χθόν-ιο-s; the Preposition merely makes it clear in what sense the Suffix -ιο is to be understood—‘belonging to the earth’ by being *under* it.

128.] Accentuation. The Accent generally falls on the last syllable of the prefixed Stem, or if that is impossible, then as far back as possible; χρυσό-θρονος, ἀελλό-πος, ἐπ-ήρατο-s (ἐρατό-s), αλν-αρέτη-s (ἀρετή), &c. The chief exceptions are the following:—

1. When the second Stem ends in -ο and has the force of an Active Participle, it is oxytone, or, if the penult is short, paroxytone; as ὑ-φορβό-s, δημο-εργό-s, τοξο-φόρο-s. Except Compounds with Prepositions, as ἐπί-κλοπο-s, πρό-μαχο-s, ὑπό-τροπο-s; also those in -οχο-s, and one or two more, πολλί-πορθο-s, ἀγχι-μολο-ν, ἱππό-δαμος.

2. Adjectives in -ης (Stems in -εσ), Nouns in -ευ-s, Nouns of the agent in -τηρ and -τη-s, and Abstract Nouns in -η and -ιη retain their accent; οἶνο-βαρής, ἡνι-οχεύ-s, μηλο-βοτῆρ-as, ἱππο-κορυστή-s, ἐπ-ιωγή, ἄρμα-τροχίή, ἀλασσοπιή.

But a few Adjectives in -ης are barytone, as ὕψι-πέτης, ποδ-ώκης, χαλκ-ήρης, ταυν-ήκης; also the Fem. forms ἡρι-γένεια, ληϊ-βότειρα, δυσ-αριστο-τόκεια, μισγ-άγκεια.

3. When the second Stem is a long monosyllable, it is accented: βου-πλήξ, ἀπο-ρρώξ, παρα-βλῶπ-ες, παρα-πλήγ-as, ἀ-βλής, &c. (§ 125, 2). Hence the Fem. forms βο-ῶπ-ι-s, γλαυκ-ῶπ-ι-s, &c. (as if from βο-ῶψ, γλαυκ-ῶψ, &c.).

129.] Proper Names in Greek are generally Compounds; the exceptions are chiefly names of gods, as Ζεός, Ἥρη, Ἀθήνη, &c., and of certain heroes, as Πάρις, Πρίαμος, Αἴας, Τεύκρος, &c.

Note that the gods whose names are Compound, as Διό-νυσος, Δημήτηρ, Περσε-φόνηια, are less prominent in Homer.

The second part of a Proper Name is liable to a peculiar shortening; Πάτρο-κλο-ς, Φέρε-κλος, for Πατρο-κλής, Φερε-κλής, Σθένε-λος for Σθενέ-λαο-ς, Αἰγι-σθος for Αἰγι-σθένης, Μενεσθεύς for Μενε-σθένης; cp. Εὐρυμίδης (Od. 9. 509), patronymic of Εὐρυμέδων. In these names the shorter form has (or had originally) the character of a 'nick-name,' or pet name.

In general, however, the 'pet' name is formed by dropping one of the two Stems altogether: the other Stem taking a Suffix in its place*. Thus we have in Homer the names—

in -το-ς, as Ἑκα-τος (for ἑκατη-βόλος), Εὔρυ-τος (Εὐρυ-βάτης, Εὐρύ-αλος, &c.), Ἴφι-τος, Ἐχε-τος, Λήϊ-τος.

in -τωρ, as Ἄκ-τωρ (for Ἀγέ-λαος or some other name beginning Ἀγε-), Ἐκ-τωρ (Ἐχε-), Μέν-τωρ (Μενε-), Καλή-τωρ, Ἀμύν-τωρ, &c.

in -της, as Θερσί-της (cp. Θερσί-λογος, &c.), Πολί-της, Ὀρέσ-της, Θυέσ-της, Μέν-της (cp. Μέν-τωρ).

in -ων, as Δόλ-ων, Ἀγάθ-ων (cp. Λάκων = Λακεδαιμόνιος).

in -εϋ-ς, as Περσ-εϋς (from Περσε-φόνος), Οἶν-εϋς (cp. Οἰνό-μαος, &c.), Πρωτ-εϋς, Λεοντ-εϋς, &c.

in -ιος-ς; Δολ-ίος (Δόλ-οψ, &c.) Ὀδ-ίος, Τυχ-ίος, Φήμ-ιος, Καλήσ-ιος, and many more.

in -ια-ς, -εια-ς; Πελ-ίης, Τειρεσ-ίας; Ἑρμείας, Αἰνείας, Ἀγέλας.

In these names the Suffix is not used with its proper force, but merely in imitation of the corresponding groups of Common Nouns. This is evident from the fact that so many of these words are inexplicable as Simple Nouns. Note especially the names in -το-ς and -ων from Adjectives, as Εὔρυ-το-ς, Ἴφι-το-ς, Ἀγάθ-ων; and those in -εϋ-ς from Nouns of the consonantal declension (§ 118), as Λεοντ-εϋ-ς, Αἰγ-εϋ-ς, and even from Verbs, as Περσ-εϋ-ς*.

The first part of the Compound has probably been dropped in Κλυμένη (cp. Περι-κλύμενος), Θόων (cp. Ἴππο-θόων), &c.

130.] Numerals. Although the Numerals are not properly to be counted as 'Nouns,' it will be convenient to notice here the chief peculiarities of formation which they exhibit.

1. There are two Fem. forms for εἷς, viz. μία and ἰα; also a Neut. Dat. ἰῶ (Il. 6. 422). The Stem ἄ- (for *sm-*) in ἄ-παξ, ἄ-πλοος, &c. is to be regarded as a weak form of the Stem ἐν- (*sam*). The weak form *sm-* is to be traced in μία, for σμ-ιά.

2. The forms δύο and δύω are equally common in Homer.

* Aug. Fick, *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt*, Göttingen, 1874.

For the number 12 we find the three forms *δωδέκα*, *δώδεκα*, and *δυοκαδέκα*; also the Ordinals *δυωδέκατος* and (rarely) *δωδέκατος*.

3. Besides *τέσσαρ-ες* there is a form *πίσυρ-ες*, applied to horses in Il. 15. 680 and 23. 171, to other objects in Il. 24. 233 and three times in the Odyssey (5. 70., 16. 249., 22. 111).

The Stem *τετρά-* appears in the Dat. *τέτρα-σι*, also in the Ordinal (*τέτρα-τος* and *τέταρ-τος*), and most derivatives, as *τετρά-κισ*, *τετρα-χθά*, *τετρά-φαλος* *four-crested*, &c. (but cp. *τεσσαρά-βοιος* *worth four oxen*): also with loss of the first syllable in *τρά-πεζα*.

The variation in the Stem of this Numeral has been fully discussed by Joh. Schmidt (*K. Z.* xxv. p. 47 ff.). He shows that the Stem had three forms (§ 114*). The strong form is seen in Sanscr. *catvāras*, which would lead us to expect Greek **τετῤῥῶρες* (hence perhaps Dor. *τέτορες*); the weakest in the Sanscr. Ordinal *turīya*, for *ktur-īya*, in which the shortening affects both syllables, and the first is consequently lost. This weakest Stem appears in *την-φάλεια* *a four-ridged helmet*, and is not derived from the form *τετρά-*. It probably fell into disuse owing to its unlikeness to *τέσσαρες*; accordingly it has only survived in words in which the meaning 'four' had ceased to be felt.

The form *πίσυρες* may be akin to Lesbian *πίσσυρες* or *πέσυρες*, but there is no decisive ground for regarding it as Æolic.

4. *ὀκτώ*, like *δύω*, is a Dual in form. The primitive ending -ω (Sanscr. *ashtāu*) may be traced in *ὄγδοος* (*ὄγδωF-os*, *ὄγδωος*, Lat. *octāvus*).

5. Under *ἐννέα* note the varieties *ἐνα-τος* and *εἵνα-τος* *ninth*, probably for *ἐνφα-τος*; so *εἰνά-κισ*, *εἰνά-νυχες*, *εἰνά-ερες*; also *ἐνν-ῆμαρ* (for *ἐννέ-ημαρ*), *ἐννέ-ωρος* *of nine seasons*, *ἐννήκοντα* (for *ἐννε-ήκοντα*, cp. *τρι-ήκοντα*, &c.) and *ἐνενήκοντα*—the last a form difficult to explain.

The numbers above ten are generally denoted by Compounds of the kind called *Copulative* (Sanscr. *dvandva*): *δύω-δεκα* *two and ten*.

The analogy of the Numerals ending in -ᾱ (*ἐπτά*, *δέκα*, with the Stems *τετρά-*, *εἰνά-*) has led to the use of ᾱ as a connecting vowel in Numerals generally; hence *πεντά-ερες* and *ἑξά-ερες* (Od. 3. 115), *ὀκτά-κνημος*, *τεσσαρά-βοιος*, *ἑικοσά-βοιος*. But inversely ο is found for ᾱ in *πεντηκοντό-γυος* (Il. 9. 579); cp. § 124, a.

CHAPTER VII.

USE OF THE CASES.

Introductory.

131.] The Case-Endings and Adverbial Endings serve (as has been said in § 90) to show the relation in which the words to which they are suffixed (Nouns, Pronouns, Adverbs, &c.) stand to the Verb of the Sentence.

This relation may be of three kinds :—

1. The Noun or Pronoun may express the Subject of the Verb : or rather (since a Subject is already given by the Person-Ending) it may *qualify* or *define* the Subject so given. *E.g.* in the sentence βασιλεὺς δίδω-σι *the-king he-gives* βασιλεὺς explains the Subject given by the Ending -σι.

2. The Noun &c. may qualify the Predicate given by the Stem of the Verb. *E.g.* in ταῦτα δίδω-σι, ἐμοὶ δίδω-σι, καλῶς δίδω-σι, ἀπο-δίδω-σι the Noun (Pronoun, Adverb, Preposition) qualifies the meaning expressed in the Stem δίδω-.

Constructions of these two kinds are found in Sentences which involve the addition of one word only to the Verb. Those of the second kind might be called 'Adverbial'—using the term in the widest sense, for a word construed with a Verb-Stem.

Note that a Nominative may be used 'adverbially': *e.g.* βασιλεὺς ἐσ-τι may mean *he-is king* (as well as *the king he-is*). See § 162.

3. The Noun &c. may be connected with, and serve to qualify, another Noun or Adverbial word. *E.g.* in the sentences βασιλέως υἱὸς δίδωσι, Κύρου βασιλέως περιγίγνεται, the word βασιλέως is not connected with the Verb, but with a Noun.

If the former constructions are 'Adverbial,' these might be called 'Adnominal' or 'Adjectival.' The Sentences in which they are found must contain at least *two* words besides the Verb; they are therefore of a higher order of structure than the two former kinds.

From these relations, again, more complex forms of structure are derived in several ways, which it will be enough to indicate in the briefest manner.

A Verb compounded with a Preposition becomes for the purposes of construction a new Verb, with a syntax of its own.

Similarly, the phrase formed by a Verb and a Noun (Case-form or Adverb) may be equivalent in the construction to a single Verb, and may take a further Adverb, or govern Cases of Nouns accordingly. *E.g.* in κακὰ ῥέξει τινά *he does evil to some*

one the Acc. *τινά* is governed by the phrase *κακὰ ῥέξει* : in *τίεν ἴσα τέκεσσι* *honoured like his children* the Dat. *τέκεσσι* is governed by *τίεν ἴσα*.

Again, the new Case-form or Adverb so 'governed' by a Verb and Noun may belong in sense to the Noun. Thus in the sentence *μέγ' ἑξοχος ἐπλετο* *he is greatly eminent*, since *ἑξοχος* expresses the meaning which *μέγα* is intended to qualify, we may consider that practically *μέγα* is construed with *ἑξοχος* alone. Evidently a qualification of this kind will generally apply only to an Adjective* (just as the degrees of comparison are essentially adjectival). In this way it comes about that an Adverb may in general be used to qualify an Adjective; and that very many Adjectives and Adverbs 'govern' the same Cases as the Verbs which correspond to them in meaning. *E.g.* in *οὐτ' εἵκελος ἀλκὴν* the Adj. *εἵκελος* takes the construction of a Verb meaning *to be like*.

In a strictly scientific treatment of the Cases the various constructions with the Verb should come before the constructions with Nouns and Prepositions. Such a treatment, however, would have the inconvenience of frequently separating uses of the same Case which are intimately connected. *E.g.* the construction *ἀλγεῖ τὴν κεφαλὴν* (2) cannot well be separated from the extension of the same construction in *μέγας ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα* (3). The Nominative, too, is used not only as the Subject, but also as the Predicate, or part of it. It will be best therefore to take the several Cases in succession, and to begin with the 'oblique' Cases.

The Accusative.

132.] Internal and External Object. The uses of the Accusative have been divided into those in which the Acc. repeats, with more or less modification, the meaning given by the Verb, and those in which the action of the Verb is limited or directed by an 'Object' wholly distinct from it. *E.g.* in the sentence *ἑλκος ὃ με οὔρασε*, lit. *the wound which he wounded me*, *ὃ* (*ἑλκος*) qualifies *οὔρασε* by a word which expresses to some extent the same *thing* as the Verb *οὔρασε*: whereas *με* qualifies it in a different way. As the latter kind of Acc. had been known as the Acc. of the EXTERNAL OBJECT, so the former has more recently been termed the Acc. of the INTERNAL OBJECT. We shall take first the different uses which fall under the description of the 'Acc. of the Internal Object.'

The foundation of this division (as Delbrück observes, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 29) is the circumstance that all Accusatives which

* In later Greek Adverbs are constantly used to qualify substantives: as *ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς, ὁ πρὶν χρόνος*, &c. But this use only becomes possible when we have the Article to show how the Adverb is to be understood.

do not express the external Object of an action may be explained in nearly the same way. The real difficulty arises when we try to find a principle which will explain these different Accusatives and at the same time exclude the relations expressed by other Cases or Adverbial forms. No such principle can be laid down. The fact seems to be that the Accusative originally had a very wide 'Adverbial' use, which was encroached upon by the more specific uses of other Cases. The different constructions included under the 'Internal Object' have all the appearance of fragments of an earlier more elastic usage.

133.] Neuter Pronouns may be used in the Accusative 'adverbially,' i. e. to define the action of the Verb: as Il. 1. 289 ἄ τιν' οὐ πείσεσθαι ὅτω *in which I think that some one will not obey*; Il. 14. 249 ἄλλο ἐπίνυσσεν *gave another lesson*; Od. 23. 24 τοῦτο ὀνήσει *will do this benefit*; Od. 10. 75 τὸδ' ἱκάνεις *comest as thou dost*; Il. 5. 827 μήτε σύ γ' Ἄρηα τό γε δέιδιθι *fear not Ares as to this*; τόδε χῶεο *be angry at this*; τάδε μαίνεται *does these mad things* (=is mad with these acts).

This use includes the Adverbial τί *why?* (e.g. τί ἦλθες *in regard to what have you come?* = what means your coming?): τό *therefore* (§ 262, 3), ὅ, ὅτι *because, that* (§ 269): τι *in any way*, οὐδέν *not at all*, ἀμφοτέρων *for both reasons* (Il. 7. 418), δοιὰ *in two ways* (Od. 2. 46), πάντα *altogether, &c.*; also the combination of Pronoun and Adverb in τὸ πρὶν, τὸ πάρος, &c. *the time before* (see § 260, b).

134.] Neuter Adjectives are often used in this way; as εὐρὺν ῥέει *flows in a broad stream*, ὀξέα κεκληγῶς *uttering shrill cries*; so πρῶτον, πρῶτα *in the first place*, πολύ, πολλόν, πολλά *much*, μέγα *greatly*, ὀλίγον, τυτθόν *little*, ἴσον, ἴσα *equally*; ὅσον, τόσον, τοῖον; ἀντίον, ἐναντίον; ὕστερον, ὕστατα, μᾶλλον, μάλιστα, ἄσσον, ἄγχιστα; εὖ (Neut. of ἥς or ἔς), ἡδύ, δεινόν, δεινά, αἰνά, καλόν, καλά, πυκνά, μακρά, ἀδινά, βαρύ, βαρέα, ὀξύ, ταρφέα, ὑπέρμορα, ἐνδέξια, ὄχα, ἔξοχα; and many more.

In general there is no difference perceptible between the Neut. Sing. and Neut. Plur. But compare τυτθόν *for a little space*, and τυτθὰ κέσσαι *split into little pieces* (Od. 12. 388).

Note the combination of Pronoun and Adjective in τὸ πρῶτον, τὰ πρῶτα, τὸ τρίτον, τὰ τέταρτον: also in τὰ ἄλλα *in other respects*.

This construction is very common in Homer, and may almost be said to be the usual Homeric mode of forming an Adverb. It has been already observed that Adverbs in -ως are comparatively rare in Homer (§ 110).

135.] Cognate Accusative. This term denotes that the Verb

K

is construed with a Substantive in the Acc. of 'cognate' form, or at least of equivalent meaning.

A Cognate Acc. is generally used to introduce the Adjective or Pronoun which really qualifies or defines the predication contained in the Verb: *e.g.* ἀπρηκτον πόλεμον πολεμίζειν *to wage a war without result* (cp. the adverbial use of a Neut. Adj. in ἄλληκτον πολεμίζειν *to war without ceasing*); δς κεν ἀρίστην βουλήν βουλευσῇ *who shall give the best counsel* (= ἀριστα βουλεύσῃ); ἐφίλει παντοίην φιλότητα *treated with all manner of love*; ἰέναι τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδόν *to go the same way*. So ἐπί-κλησιν καλέουσι *call by way of surname*: and with a Noun in the Plural, βουλὰς βουλεύειν *to give counsel* (from time to time); δάσσαντο μοίρας *divided into the several shares*; αἰχμὰς αἰχμάσσουσι νεώτεροι (with repetition for the sake of emphasis), &c.

With a Pronoun referring to a cognate Noun; λώβης . . ἦν ἐμὲ λωβήσασθε, ἔλκος ὃ με βροτὸς οὔτασεν, ὑπόσχεσις ἦν περ ὑπέστην, &c.

136.] Other Adverbial Accusatives. The following uses may be placed here as more or less analogous to the Cognate Accusative:

(1) Substantives expressing a particular *sphere* or *kind* of the action denoted by the Verb: as—

Π. 6. 292 ἤγαγε Σιδουλήθεν . . τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν Ἑλένην περ ἀνήγαγε *the voyage on which he brought back Helen*: (cp. Od. 6. 164 ἦλθον γὰρ καὶ κεῖσε . . τὴν ὁδὸν ἣ δὴ κτλ.); so ὁδὸν οἴχεσθαι, ὁδὸν ἡγήσασθαι *to lead on the way*; and again ἐξεσίην ἐλθεῖν *to go on an expedition* (and in Od. 21. 20 ἐξεσίην πολλὴν ὁδὸν ἦλθεν *went a long way on an expedition*), ἀγγελίην ἐλθόντα *going on a message*; βουλὰς ἐξάρχων ἀγαθὰς *taking the lead in good counsels*; Od. 8. 23 ἀέθλους . . τοὺς . . ἐπειρήσαντ' Ὀδυσῆος; Od. 19. 393 οὐλήν τὴν ποτὲ μιν σὺς ἤλασε. So δαυνόντα γάμον *holding a wedding-feast*, δαῖνν τάφον *gave a funeral feast* (whereas the cognate δαίτην δαιτυμένους means *holding an ordinary feast*); ξυνάγωμεν Ἀρηα *let us join battle*, ἐριδα ῥήγνυντο βαρείαν *broke in grievous strife*.

So probably we should explain Π. 1. 31 ἐμὸν λόχος ἀντιώσων, like Π. 15. 33 φιλότης τε καὶ εὐνὴ ἦν ἐμύγης (cp. Pind. N. 1. 67 ὅταν θεοὶ . . γιγάντεσσι μάχαν ἀντιάσῃσι). Also Od. 6. 259 ὅφρ' ἂν μὲν κ' ἀγροὺς ἴομεν καὶ ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων *so long as our way is through fields and tillage of men*,—ἀγροὺς=ὁδὸν ἐν ἀγροῖς.

Note that this construction is chiefly applied to the *familiar* spheres of action—battle, council, feasting, &c.

(2) Abstract Nouns expressing an *attribute* of the action.

Π. 9. 115 οὐ τι ψεύδος ἐμὰς ἀπας κατέλεξας *with no falsehood*

hast thou recounted my folly: Od. 7. 297 ταῦτά τοι . . ἀληθείην κατέλεξα.

So δέμας (in phrases like δέμας πυρός *like fire*), and the Adverbs ἄκην, ἄδην, λίην, with many others (see § 110), are originally the Accusatives of Abstract Nouns.

Add the poetical expressions such as πῦρ ὀφθαλμοῖσι δεδορκώς *with look of fire*, μένεα πνείοντες *breathing martial fury*.

The phrase πῦρ δεδορκώς is a boldness of language (compared e.g. with δεινὸν δερκόμενοι) analogous to that which we observed in Compounds such as ἀελλό-πος *with storm-(like) feet*, as compared with ἀκύ-ποδες, &c.; see § 126.

(3) The words ἔργον, ἔπος, μῦθος, with Pronouns, are used nearly as the Neuter of the same Pronouns: as—

Π. 1. 294 πᾶν ἔργον ὑπείξομαι *I shall yield in every matter* (πᾶν ἔργον=πάντα): 5. 757 οὐ νεμεσίξῃ Ἄρει τάδε καρτερὰ ἔργα (constr. like τόδε χῶεο); cp. 9. 374.

Od. 3. 243 ἔπος ἄλλο μεταλλῆσαι *to ask another question*.

Π. 5. 715 ἦ ῥ' ἄλιον τὸν μῦθον ὑπέστημεν *our promise was idle*.

(4) Words expressing the *sum* or *result* of an action are put in the Acc.; as Π. 4. 207 ἔβαλεν . . τῷ μὲν κλέος ἄμμι δὲ πένθος; 24. 735 ῥίψει χειρὸς ἐλὼν ἀπὸ πύργου λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον: Od. 6. 184. So ποιῶν *in compensation*, πρόφασιν *on the pretence*, ἐπίκλησιν *nominally*, χάριν *as a favour* (only in Π. 15. 744).

The use of Substantives to qualify a Verb evidently bears the same relation to the use of Neut. Adjectives as Nouns in Apposition bear to ordinary Adjectives qualifying Nouns.

Note. Many of these constructions have been treated as varieties or extensions of the 'Cognate Accusative.' E.g. from ὁδὸν ἐλθεῖν have been explained, on the one hand, ὁδὸν ἡγήσασθαι, ὁδὸν ἀνήγαγε, &c., on the other, ἀγγελίην ἐλθεῖν, &c.; so δαίνυντο γάμον, δαίνυ τάφον, have been regarded as modelled on δαίτην δαίνυσθαι; μῦθον ὑπέστημεν as justified because a promise is a μῦθος, ψεῦδος κατέλεξας because ψεῦδος=*a false tale*, and so on. It must not be supposed, however, that these analogies explain any of the uses in question, or that the 'Cognate' Acc. is prior to the others, either in simplicity or in the order of development. If we compare the Cognate Acc. with the use of Neuter Adjectives and Pronouns, we see that (e.g.) ἀρίστα βουλευεῖν is simpler, and doubtless earlier in type, than ἀρίστην βουλήν βουλεύειν, ἃ περ ὑπέστην than ὑπόσχεσιν ἢ περ ὑπέστην, τὰ ὑπέστημεν than τὸν μῦθον ὑπέστημεν. Again, δαίνυσθαι γάμον is probably an earlier phrase than the tautologous δαίνυσθαι δαίτην, τὸν μῦθον ὑποστήναι than ὑπόσχεσιν ὑποστήναι, &c. The repetition in the Noun of the Stem already given in the Verb is a feature of complexity which itself needs explaining. The Cognate Acc., in short, is only a special form of the use of the Acc. as a *defining* or *qualifying* word. Grammarians have explained other constructions by its help because it is familiar; but in so doing they have fallen into the error of deriving the simple from the complex.

137.] Accusatives of the 'part affected.' Many verbs that are Intransitive or Reflexive in sense take an Acc. restricting

the force of the Verb to a *part* or *attribute* of the subject: as *κάμνει χεῖρα* *his hand is weary*, *πυρὶ χείρας* *ἔοικε* *his hands are as fire*, *βλήτο κνήμην* *was wounded in the shin*, *ἀλλάων περίεμι νόον* *I am beyond others in understanding*; *φρένα τέρπετ'* *ἀκούων* *was pleased at heart listening*; *οὐ λῆγε μένος* *ceased not in his fury*; *γένος δ' ἦν ἐκ ποταμοῖο* *in descent he was from the river*, *γενεὴν ἔφκει* (Il. 14. 474) *was like in descent*, i. e. bore 'a family likeness'; *ἀθανάτησι δέμας καὶ εἶδος ἐρίξειν* *to rival the immortals in form and feature*. See § 141.

These uses differ from other Accusatives of the *sphere* of an action in the distinctly *concrete* nature of the words employed. The Acc. does not express the notion of the Verb, or an attribute of it, but merely denotes a *thing* by reference to which it is limited or characterised. Thus in *κάμνει χεῖρα* the Acc. limits the action *κάμνει*—'feels hand-weariness.' The relation is local or instrumental, though not so expressed. The meaning 'in or with the hand' is conveyed, because it is the only one possible—the only way in which the notion *hand* can qualify the notion *weariness*.

The 'Acc. of the part affected,' or 'Acc. of reference,' is characteristic of Greek: hence it is called *Accusativus Graecus* by the Latin grammarians. It is unknown, or nearly so, in Sanscrit. We cannot infer, however, that it originated with the Greeks, especially as it is found in Zend (Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. 33): but it may have been extended in Greek. The alternative Case is generally the Instrumental: cp. Il. 3. 194 *εὐρύτερος ὁμοῖσιν ἰδὲ στέρνοισιν ἰδέσθαι*, but 2. 478 *ὄμματα καὶ κεφαλὴν ἱκελος Διὸς*. Or the sense may be further defined by a Preposition: *πρὸς στήθος*, *κατὰ φρένα*, &c.

138.] Accusative of Time and Space. The word expressing *duration* of time is put in the Acc., as *ἓνα μῆνα μένων* *waiting a month*, *χεῖμα εὖδει* *sleeps through the winter*, *τρὶς ἀνάξασθαι γένε' ἀνδρῶν* *to reign for three generations of men*.

The Accusative of Space expresses the *extent* of an action, as Il. 23. 529 *λείπετο δούρῳ ἐρωήν* *was a spear's throw behind*.

These Accusatives are to be compared with the Neuter Adjectives of quantity, as *πολύ*, *ὀλίγον*, *τυτθόν*, *τόσον*, &c.

139.] Accusative with Nouns. The chief uses are:—

(1) Neut. Adjectives, as *μέγ' ἔξοχος* *greatly surpassing*.

(2) Cognate Accusative, as Il. 15. 641 *ἀμείνων παντοίας ἀρετάς* *better in every kind of excellence*. This is rare in Homer.

(3) Acc. of the 'part affected'; *ὄμματα καὶ κεφαλὴν ἱκελος* *like in eyes and head*, (cp. *χείρας ἔοικε*), *βοὴν ἀγαθός* *good in shouting*,

γένος κακὸς καὶ ἀναλκίς *a coward by right of descent*. With a Substantive: χεῖράς τ' αἰχμητὴν ἔμειναι.

140.] **Accusative of the External Object.** Under this head it is unnecessary to do more than notice one or two points:—

(1) The ceremonial words ἀπάρχω, κατάρχομαι, &c. are construed according to the acquired meaning: as τρίχας ἀπάρχειν *to cut off hair as a preliminary*, cp. Od. 3. 445 (with the note in Riddell and Merry's edition). So Il. 24. 710 τὸν . . τιλλέσθην *mourned him by tearing their hair*: and ὄρκια τέμνειν *to make a treaty* (by slaying a victim).

(2) The Verbs εἶπον, αὐδῶ, &c. may take an Acc. of the person spoken to: Il. 5. 170 ἔπος τέ μιν ἀντίον ἦν δα: Il. 13. 725 Πουλυδάμας θρασὺν Ἑκτορα εἶπε. Cp. Il. 9. 59., 17. 651, Od. 4. 155. But this construction is rare with the simple Verbs: it is found *passim* with Compounds (προσηύδα, προσέειπε, &c.).

(3) An Acc. may be used of the person *about* whom something is *told, known, thought, &c.*—

(a) If a person or a thing is treated as the *thing said, known, &c.* (not merely spoken or known *about*): as Il. 1. 90 οὐδ' ἦν Ἀγαμέμνονα εἶπης *not even if you say Agamemnon* (cp. οὐνομα εἰπεῖν); 3. 192 εἰπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε *tell me this man too*. So with οἶδα when it means only to know *what a thing is*: as Il. 6. 150 ὅφρ' ἐν εἰδῆς ἡμετέρην γενεήν, πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἴσασιν: and with μέμνημαι, as Il. 9. 527 μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον; Il. 23. 361 ὥς μεμνέωτο δρόμους *that he might remember the courses* (i.e. remember how many there were); Il. 6. 222 Τυδεία δ' οὐ μέμνημαι (of remembering his existence). The Acc. implies that the person is the whole *fact* remembered. But with a Gen. μέμνημαι means *I remember something about, I bethink myself of* (§ 151, d).

(b) If the real Object of the Verb is a *fact* expressed by a limiting word or clause: as Il. 2. 81 ψευδός κεν φαίμεν *we should call it false*; Il. 6. 50 αἶ κεν ἐμὲ ζῶν πεπύθοιτο *if he heard of me alive* (of my being alive); Il. 5. 702 ἐπύθοντο μετὰ Τρώεσσιν Ἄρηα *heard of Ares (as) among the Trojans*. Especially with a Participle, as Od. 17. 549 εἰ κ' αὐτὸν γνώω νημερτέα πάντ' ἐνέποντα *if I find him telling (that he is telling) nothing but truth* (§ 245, 2). And with a subordinate clause, as Il. 2. 409 ἦδε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀδελφεὸν ὥς ἐπονείτο; Il. 8. 535 αὐρίον ἦν ἀρετὴν διαίεσται εἰ κ' ἐμὸν ἔγχος μείνῃ ἐπερχόμενον *he will know about his valour, whether he will withstand my spear* (i.e. whether his valour is such that &c.); cp. 13. 275., 18. 601., 20. 311.

(4) The Acc. of the object to which motion is directed (*terminus ad quem*) is common with ἰκνέομαι, ἰκω, ἰκάνω (which always

imply *reaching* a point), but is comparatively rare with other simple Verbs, such as *εἶμι*, *έρχομαι*, *νέομαι*, *ἄγω*, *ἡγέομαι*. The words so used with these Verbs are mostly Nouns denoting *house* (*δῶ*, Il. 7. 363, &c.; *δόμον*, Od. 7. 22, Il. 22. 482; *οἶκον*, Od. 14. 167), *city* (Od. 6. 114., 15. 82), *native land* (Il. 7. 335., 15. 706): cp. also Il. 1. 322 *έρχεσθον κλισίην*; 6. 37 *ξυνάγουσα γεραιὰς νηόν*; 21. 40 *Λήμνον ἐπέρασσεν*; Od. 4. 478 *Αἰγύπτιοι ὕδωρ ἔλθης*.

Compound Verbs—esp. with the Prepositions *εἰς*, *ἐπί*, *πρός*, *ὑπό*, *παρά*—usually take an Acc. of this kind.

There is no reason to infer from these and similar instances that the Accusative is originally the Case of the *terminus ad quem*. It is natural that a Verb of motion should be defined or qualified by a Noun expressing *place*, and that such a Noun should generally denote the place to which the motion is directed. But this is not necessary. The Acc. is used with Verbs denoting *motion from*, as *φεύγω*, *νοσφίζομαι*, *ὑποείκω* (Il. 15. 228); and even with other Verbs of motion it may express the *terminus a quo* if the context suggests it, as *ἀνέδυστο κύμα* *rose from the wave*, *ὑπερώϊα κατέβαινε* *came down from the upper chambers*.

The uses with Prepositions are treated of in the sections dealing with the several Prepositions (181–218).

141.] **Double Accusatives.** It is needless to enumerate the different circumstances in which a Verb may be construed with two Accusatives. Many examples will be found among the passages already quoted; and it will be seen that the combination of an Acc. of the External Object with one of the various ‘Accusatives of the Internal Object’ is especially frequent. Thus with Verbs of *saying* the Acc. of the *thing* said may be combined with an Acc. of the *person* spoken to: as Il. 5. 170 *ἔπος τέ μιν ἀντίον ἦῶδα* (so 9. 58., 16. 207, Od. 23. 91). Again, with Verbs of *taking away* there may be an Acc. of the *thing* taken and the *person* from whom it is taken: as Il. 8. 108 *οὓς ποτ’ ἀπ’ Αἰνείαν ἔλδμην*, Il. 6. 70 *ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τὰ ἔκρηλοι νεκροὺς ἀμ πεδίον συλήσετε* (cp. 16. 58., 17. 187). So with Verbs of *cleansing*; Il. 16. 667 *κελαινεφὲς αἷμα κάθηρον ἔλθων ἐκ βελέων Σαρπηδόνα* (cp. 18. 345); also Od. 6. 224 *χρόα νίζετο δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἄλμην*, and (with three Accusatives) Il. 21. 122 *οἱ σ’ ὠπτεῖλν αἷμ’ ἀπολαχμήσονται*. In such cases the Verb almost seems to be used in different senses—*cleanse* Sarpedon, *cleanse away* the blood, &c.

In some cases the two Accusatives are not to be explained independently, but one is construed with the phrase formed by the Verb in combination with the other. Thus we cannot say *ῥέξειν τινά* *to do to a person*, but we may have *κακὸν ῥέξειν τινά* *to do evil to a person or thing*: e.g.—

Il. 9. 540 *ὃς κακὰ πόλλ’ ἔρδεσκειν ἔθων Οἰνῆος ἀλωήν*.

647 *ὥς μ’ ἀσύφηλον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν*.

The notion 'doing' given by *ῥέζω* is so vague that an Acc. of the person would be ambiguous: but the more definite notions of doing evil, &c. become susceptible of the construction. So with *εἰπεῖν*, as Od. I. 302 *ἵνα τίς σε ἐν εἴπῃ* *may speak well of thee*: cp. Il. 6. 479.

A similar account is to be given of the 'Accusative of the Whole and Part,' which is very common in Homer; *e.g.* τὸν βάλε κνήμην *him he smote on the shin*, σὲ φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων *has escaped you over the fence of teeth*. The second Acc. has been sometimes explained as parallel in construction to the first, the part being added 'epexegetically' or in 'Apposition' to the whole. But it is impossible to separate τὸν βάλε κνήμην from βλήτο κνήμην: in both the Acc. of the part is a *limiting* Accusative. The difference between this and a double Acc. arising from Apposition appears if we consider that

Τρῶας δὲ τρόμος αἰνὸς ὑπήλυθε γυῖα ἕκαστον

is equivalent to Τρῶες ἔτρεμον τὰ γυῖα ἕκαστος, where ἕκαστος is (as before) epexegetic of Τρῶες, but γυῖα is an Acc. qualifying the Verb.

The Dative.

142.] Comparison of the Case-system of Greek with that of Sanscrit shows that the Greek Dative does the work of three Sanscrit Cases, the Dative, the Instrumental, and the Locative. There is also reason to think that distinct forms for these three Cases survived down to a comparatively late period in Greek itself. This is made probable (1) by the traces in Homeric Greek of Instrumental and Locative Case-forms, and (2) by the readiness with which the *uses* of the Greek Dative (especially in Homer) can be re-apportioned between the three Cases—the original or true Dative, and the two others.

143.] The true Dative expresses the person *to* or *for* whom something is done, or who is regarded as chiefly affected or interested: *e.g.*—

Il. I. 283 Ἀχιλλῆϊ μεθέμεν χόλον *to put away his anger for (in favour of) Achilles*; cp. Od. II. 553.

Od. I. 9 τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο *took away for (i. e. from) them*.

Il. 21. 360 τί μοι ἔριδος καὶ ἀρωγῆς; *what is there for me (that concerns me) in strife and help?*

Od. 7. 303 μὴ μοι τοῦνεκ' ἀμύμονα νείκεε κούρην *chide not for me on that account the blameless maiden*; cp. Il. 14. 501.

Od. 9. 42 ὥς μὴ τίς μοι ἀπεμβόμενος κλοι ἴσῃς *that for me no one should go away wronged (i. e. that I might see that no one &c.)*.

Il. I. 250 τῷ δύο γενεαὶ ἐφθίατο *he had seen two generations pass*.

Π. 12. 374 ἐπειγομένοισι δ' ἴκοντο *they came for them when hard pressed, i. e. their coming was (what such a thing is) to hard pressed men.* So Π. 14. 108 ἐμοὶ δέ κεν ἀσμένῳ εἴη *it would be for me when welcoming it, i. e. would be what I welcome: Od. 21. 115 οὐ κέ μοι ἀγνυμένῳ κτλ.*

The Dat. with Verbs of *giving, showing, telling (a fact), praying, helping, pleasing, favouring, being angry, &c.*, and the corresponding Adjectives (φίλος, ἐχθρός, &c.), is evidently of this kind.

The so-called *Dativus commodi*, 'Ethical Dative,' &c. need not be separated from the general usage. Note however that—

1. The Dative of the Personal Pronouns is very often used where we should have a Possessive agreeing with a Noun in the Clause; as Π. 1. 104 ὅσσε δέ οἱ πυρὶ ἔκτεν *his eyes were like fire*; Od. 2. 50 μητέρι μοι μνηστῆρες ἐπέχραον *the suitors have assailed my mother*; so Π. 1. 55, 150, 188, 200, &c.

2. δέχομαι with the Dat. means *to take as a favour*: Π. 15. 87 Θέμιστι δέκτο δέπας *accepted the cup from Themis (as a compliment)*; or *to take as an attendant does*, Π. 2. 186., 13. 710., 17. 207, Od. 15. 282. For the Gen. see § 152.

3. ἀκούω with the Dat. means *to hear favourably*; Π. 16. 515 ἀκούειν ἀνέρι κηδομένῳ; and so κλῦθί μοι in prayers (Π. 5. 115, Od. 2. 262). See § 151, d.

4. The Dat. with Verbs meaning *to give commands* (κελεύω, σημαίνω, &c.), and *to lead the way* (ἄρχω, ἡγέομαι, ἡγεμονεύω) is apparently the true Dat. But this does not apply to Verbs meaning *to have power, to be king* (as κρατέω, ἀνάσσω): e.g. ἀναστέμεν Ἀργείοισι probably means *to be king among the Argives* (Loc.). See § 145 (7, a).

5. The 'Dat. of the Agent' with Passive Verbs seems to be a special application of the true Dat.; cp. Π. 13. 168 ὃ οἱ κλισίῃφι λέλειπτο *which for him was (= which he had) left in the tent, ἔχεθ' Ἔκτορι was had as wife by Hector.* So Τρῶσιν δαμναμένους, Πηλείωνι δαμείς, &c. because the victory is *gained* by the victor; and so in Attic, ἡβροίσθη Κύρῳ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν *Cyrus got his Greek force collected.* The restriction to Past Tenses is intelligible, because the *past fact* is thought of as a kind of *possession* or *advantage* (cp. the English auxiliary *have* of past events). This view is strongly supported by the Latin Dat. of the Agent, which is not common except with Verbals and Past Participles (Roby, § 1146). Evidently *nobis facienda* = 'things for us to do,' *nobis facta* = 'things we have got done.'

The true Dat. of Nouns denoting *things* is rare in Greek (perhaps only used when the thing is regarded as an agent, or stands for a person, as Πριάμοιο βίη for Πρίαμος).

In this respect Latin offers a marked contrast; cp. the various uses, especially of abstract Substantives, explained by Mr. Roby under the headings 'indirect object' (1143, n. 11), 'work contemplated' (1156), 'predicative dative' (1158 ff.). The source of the difference evidently is that the Dat. is not liable, as in Greek, to be confounded with the Loc. and Instrum. It will be seen however that the Greek Infinitive is in fact the Dat. of an abstract Substantive.

144.] The Instrumental Dative. The so-called Instrumental Case appears to have been employed to express whatever accompaniments or shares in an action:—not only the instrument or cause, but any attendant object or circumstance. Hence it covers the ground of the Datives of 'circumstance,' 'manner,' &c.

The Dat. of *circumstance* &c. is common with abstract or semi-abstract words: as ἡχῇ *with noise* (κλαγγῇ, ἀλαλητῶ, ἐνοπῇ, &c.); σιγῇ, σιωπῇ; αἰδοῖ *with reverence* (Od. 8. 172); ἀνάγκῃ, βίῃ, σπουδῇ; κακῇ αἰσῇ *with evil fortune*; φυγῇ (ἴκοντο) *in flight*; κερδοσύνῃ *in his cunning*; γενεῇ *by descent*.

In Homer it often expresses the *reason* or *occasion* (for which διὰ with the Acc. is regular in later Greek): Od. 3. 363 φιλότῃτι ἐπονται *accompany out of friendship (propter amorem)*; Od. 9. 19 δς πᾶσι δόλοισιν ἀνθρώποισι μέλω *who am regarded by men for my craft* (cp. 13. 299); Il. 16. 628 ὀνειδείοις ἐπέεσσι χωρήσουσι *will give way for reviling words*; Od. 14. 206 τίετο . . ὄλβῳ τε πλούτῳ τε καὶ νιάσιν; Od. 17. 423 οἷσιν τ' εὖ ζῶουσι καὶ ἀφνειοὶ καλέονται *things because of which men live well and are called opulent*. So of an almost personal agent, Od. 14. 299 ἡ δ' ἔθεεν Βορρῇ ἀνέμῳ *the ship coursed on with (driven by) the North wind*.

The 'comitative' or 'sociative' sense is chiefly found in the Plural, which denotes *attendants, surroundings, adjuncts, &c.*; Il. 18. 506 τοῖσιν ἔπειρ' ἦϊσσον *with these (the sceptres) they started up*; Od. 4. 8 ἵπποισι καὶ ἄρμασι πέμπε *sent with horses and chariots* (cp. 4. 533); Od. 11. 161 νηὶ τε καὶ ἐτάροισι *with a ship and comrades*; Il. 12. 28 κύμασι πέμπε *let go with the waves*; Il. 2. 818 μεμαῶτες ἐγγέλῃσι *ardent with their spears*; Il. 6. 243 ξεστῆς αἰθούσῃσι τετυγμένον *built with smooth porticoes* (cp. Od. 9. 185, &c.); Il. 2. 148 ἐπὶ τ' ἡμῦνι ἀσταχέεσσι *bends forward with the ears (of a field of corn)*; Il. 6. 513 τεύχεσι παμφαίνων *glittering with his armour*; similarly Il. 100 στήθεσι *shining with (naked) breasts*. For the corresponding Sing. cp. Od. 10. 140 νηὶ καταγαγόμεσθα; Od. 9. 68 ἐπ' ἄνέμον Βορρῇ λαίλαπι θεσπεσίῃ; Od. 12. 241 ὑπένερθε δὲ γαῖα φάνεσκε ψάμμῳ κυανερῇ *the ground shined beneath with its dark sand*; Il. 15. 282 ἐπιστάμενος ἄκοντι.

This Dative is idiomatically used with αὐτός: as Il. 8. 24 αὐτῇ κεν γαίῃ ἐρῶσαμ' αὐτῇ δὲ θαλάσῃ *with the earth and sea as well*

(without their losing hold): Od. 14. 77 *θέρμ' αὐτοῖς ὀβελοῖσι* *hot with the spits as they were**.

The Dative with Verbs meaning *to be with, to follow, to join, to agree with, to be like, &c.*, and again with the Prepositions *σύν* and *ἅμα*, and the various Pronouns and Adjectives meaning *the same, equal, like, &c.*, is generally Instrumental.

The Dat. with Verbs meaning *to fight, strive, &c.* may be the Instrumental or (more probably) the true Dat. Words meaning *to trust &c.* probably take an Instrumental Dat. of the *ground* of trust, a true Dat. of the *person* trusted or obeyed: cp. the Lat. construction of *confidere* with a Dat. or Abl.

With Verbs meaning *to be pleased* the Dat. is doubtless Instrumental: as Il. 21. 45 *ἐτέρπετο οἷσι φίλοισι* *had pleasure with his friends* (so Od. 14. 245). This is still more clear in Il. 5. 682 *χάρη δ' ἄρα οἱ προσιόντι* and Il. 23. 556 *χαίρων Ἀντιλόχῳ ὅτι κτλ.* 'rejoiced at the *fact* (of his coming, &c.).'

The Instrum. is used in Sanscrit of the space *over which* action extends. The nearest approach to this in Greek is the Dat. of the *way by which*: cp. the Adverbs *ῖ, τῇ, τῇδε, πῇ, ὅπῃ, πάντῃ*. But see § 158, *note*.

The Dat. is probably Instrumental (not Locative) in Od. 1. 197 *κατερύκεται εὐρέϊ πόντῳ* (*by, not on, the sea*). Also with *δέχομαι, &c.*, as Il. 6. 136 *ὑπεδέξατο κόλπῳ*, Od. 16. 70 *ὑποδέξομαι οἴκῳ*. In later Greek *δέχομαι* is construed with *οἴκῳ, πόλει, &c.* without a Preposition.

Note the occasional use of the Instrumental Dat. with Verbs of *buying*, as Il. 7. 475 *οἰνίζοντο ἄλλοι μὲν χαλκῷ κτλ.*, Od. 15. 483 *πρίατο κτεάτεσσιν ἑοῖσιν* (cp. Il. 4. 161 *σύν τε μεγάλῳ ἀπέτισαν*): with Verbs of *abounding*, Il. 17. 56 *βρύει ἀνθεῖ λευκῷ* (§ 151, e):

* Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 58) notices the difficulty of finding a special explanation of the 'sociative' use of the Dat. in combination with *αὐτός*. It may help towards such an explanation to observe that the use of a Case-form in a particular sense not unfrequently depends upon the presence of a qualifying word in agreement with it. E. g.—

ἐμοὶ βουλομένῳ ἐστὶ *it is for me what I desire.*

τοίχῳ τοῦ ἐτέρου *by the wall on the other side.*

μέσσω δούρῳ ἐλὼν *taking the spear by the middle.*

ἐλ τεθνέωτος ἀκούσαι *if he were to hear of his being dead.*

ἤχθετο Τρῳσὶν δαμναμένους *he was vexed at their being subdued by Trojans.*

In each of these instances the qualifying word indicates the sense in which the Case is used, and so makes the use possible. The 'ethical Dat.' is suggested by *βουλομένῳ*, the Gen. of *place* by *ἐτέρου*, the Gen. of *part* by *μέσσω*, the *fact about the person* by *τεθνέωτος*, the *cause of feeling* by *δαμναμένους*. Now, in such a phrase as *αὐτοῖς ὀβελοῖσι* *spits and all*, the force of *αὐτός* is 'without change,' 'as before,' and so the phrase means *with the meat sticking to the spits as before* (cp. *αὐτῶς, αὐτοῦ, αὐθι*). Thus the sociative sense is emphasised by the addition of *αὐτοῖς*. Without such an addition there would generally be nothing to decide between the different possible meanings of the Dative, and consequently a Preposition (*σύν* or *ἅμα*) would be needed.

also with a Verb of 'cognate' meaning, as *θάνον οικτίστω θανάτῳ* (Od. 11. 412), *ῥέον ὕδατι* (Od. 5. 70).

145.] The Locatival Dative. The Dative without a Preposition denoting the *place* of an action is much commoner in Homer than in later Greek, though already restricted to a comparatively narrow range. It is used—

(1) Of towns and countries: *Ἴλῳ εἰσὶ* are in *Ilios*, *Φρυγίῃ ναίεσκε* dwelt in *Phrygia*: so *Οὐλύμπῳ*, *Ἀκεδαίμονι*, *Δήλῳ*, *Σχερίῃ*, *Κυθήροισι*, *Θήβῃ*, *Κρήτῃ*, *Ἄργεϊ*, *Ἑλλάδι*, &c. So too *Ἄϊδι*.

(2) Of the great divisions of the world, the chief spheres of action, &c., as *αἰθέρι*, *οὐρανῷ*, *οὔρεσι*, *ἀγρῷ* *afield*, *δόμῳ* *in the house*, *νομῷ* *at pasture*, *πόντῳ* *out at sea*, *αἰγιαλῷ* *on the shore*, *χέρσῳ* *on dry land* (Il. 4. 424–5), *οὔδῃ* *on the ground*, *πεδίῳ*, *χθονί*; *χορῷ* *at the dance*, *μάχῃ*, *βουλῇ*, *ἀγορῇ*, *τραπέσῃ* *at table* (Od. 21. 35), *σέλαι πυρός* *in the fire light*.

But the Dat. in *ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι* (Il. 1. 8), *ὕμνῳ μάχεσθαι* (Il. 2. 863), &c. is one of *manner* (Instr.), rather than of place.

(3) Of the *parts* of a thing, especially of the body; *ὤμφ* and *ὥμοισι*, *κεφαλῇ*, *χροί*; *καρδίῃ*, *φρεσί*, *θυμῷ*; *ἀκροτάτῃ κορυφῇ*, *ἐσχατῇ πολέμοιο*, *μύχῳ Ἄργεος* (*θαλάμοιο*, &c.), *μέσῳ ἔρκει*, *πρώτῃσι πύλῃσι*, *γουνῷ ἀλώῃς*, *βένθεσι λίμνης*, *τάρφεσιν ἔλης*, &c.

The Dat. of the part *with* which a person does something may be Instrumental; as *χερσὶ μαχήσομαι*, *κεφαλῇ κατανέυσομαι*, *ἐκὼν ἀέκοντί γε θυμῷ*. But the Locative mode of expression is the prevailing one; cp. *ἐν χεῖρεσσι λάβ' ἦνια*, *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι*, *ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσί*, *ἐν θυμῷ μεμαῶτες*, &c. Hence the common use of *χειρί*, *χερσὶ*, &c. with *ἔχω*, *αἰρέω*, *λαμβάνω*, and the use of *θυμῷ*, *φρεσί*, &c. with Verbs of *knowing*, *thinking*, *feeling*, are doubtless Locatival.

(4) With some Verbs that imply locality, *ναίω*, *τίθημι*, *κεῖμαι*, *ἦμαι* (Od. 20. 22 *πυτχὶ Οὐλύμπῳ ἦμενος*); esp. *κλίνω*, as Il. 11. 371 *στήλῃ κεκλιμένος*, and (in the derived sense) Il. 5. 709 *λίμνῃ κεκλιμένος*.

(5) Of *time*: *ἡματι τῷ ὅτε κτλ.* *on the day when* &c., *θέρεϊ* *in summer*, *ὥρῃ χειμερινῇ* *in the season of winter*, &c.

(6) After a Verb of motion (where we expect *εἰς* or *πρός* with the Acc.): as Il. 5. 82 *πεδίῳ πέσε* *fell on the plain*; Il. 7. 187 *κυνέη βάλε* *threw into the helmet*; Il. 3. 10 *εὐτ' ὄρεος κορυφῇσι Νότος κατέχευεν ὁμίχλην* *has spread a mist over the tops of the mountains*; *προκαλέσατο χάρμῃ* *called out (to meet) in combat*. This idiom helps to show that the use of the Accusative for the *terminus ad quem* of motion does not represent the original force of that Case.

The Dat. after the Prepositions *ἐν*, *ἐπί*, *παρά*, *μετά*, *ὑπό*, *ἀνά*, *περί*, *ἀμφί*, and the Verbs compounded with them, is generally Locatival. It is used (like the simple Dat.) after Verbs of motion: see §§ 194, 198, 202, 206.

The sense may admit or require a true Dat.: cp. Il. i. 174 *παρ' ἐμοί γε καὶ ἄλλοι* *others are at hand with me* (Loc.), or *I have others at my command* (true Dat.). So Il. 7. 73 *ὑμῖν ἐν γὰρ ἔασι* may mean *there are among you* (Loc.), or *you have* (true Dat.) *among you*. Cp. Lat. *inesse alicui* or *in aliquo*.

(7) The Locatival Dat. of *persons* is chiefly found in the Plural:—

(a) with *κρατέω*, *ἀνάσσω*, *βασιλεύω*: Il. 2. 669 *θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀνάσσει* *is king among gods and men*; Od. i. 71 *δου κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον πᾶσιν Κυκλώπεσσι*; Il. 13. 217 *ὅς πάσῃ Πλευρώνι καὶ αἰπεινῇ Καλυδῶνι Αἰτωλοῖσιν ἀνασσε*. Cp. the equivalent constructions with Prepositions, as Il. i. 252 *μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἀνασσε*, Od. 7. 62 *ὅς ἐν Φαίηξιν ἀνασσε*, and the compound *ἐμβασιλεύω*. This group of uses is almost confined to Homer.

(b) in phrases introducing a speech, as *τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη*, *τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἦρχε*, and the like; cp. Il. 19. 175 *ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἀναστάς*, 9. 528 *ἐν δ' ὑμῖν ἐρέω*, Od. 10. 188 *μετὰ πᾶσιν ἔειπον*, 16. 378 *ἐρέει δ' ἐν πᾶσιν ἀναστάς*.

(c) meaning 'in the sight of,' 'in the opinion of,' &c. as Il. 2. 285 *πᾶσιν ἐλέγχιστον θέμεναι μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσι*: 11. 58 *ὅς Τρῶσὶ θεὸς ὥς τίετο δῆμῳ*. Cp. Il. 23. 703 *ἐνὶ σφίσι τίον*. So in Sanscrit the Loc. is used of the person *with* or *before* whom conduct is judged: 'may we be guiltless before Varuṇa' (Delbrück, *A. S.* p. 118).

(d) occasionally with Adjectives implying eminence &c., as Il. 6. 477 *ἀριπρεπία Τρῶεσσι* *distinguished among the Trojans*, Od. 15. 227 *Πυλίοισι μέγ' ἔξοχα δώματα ναίων*.

The Genitive.

146.] The Greek Genitive, as appears at once by comparison with Latin or Sanscrit, stands for the original or 'true' Genitive, and also for the Ablative. The uses of the Gen. may therefore be divided (theoretically at least) between these two Cases. The distinction however is more difficult than in the case of the Dative; partly, perhaps, because the Case-forms of the Ablative were earlier lost than those of the Locative and Instrumental, but also from the peculiar syntactical character of the Genitive.

The Ablative (like the cases already treated of) belongs originally to the second group of constructions distinguished in § 131, *i. e.* it is construed with

the predicate given by a *Verb*. The Genitive is originally of the third group ; and properly qualifies a *Noun*. Hence the Ablative and Genitive uses are generally distinguished partly in meaning, partly in grammatical structure. But they are not always distinguished by the structure, since (1) the Ablative (like the Acc. and Dat.) *may* be construed with an Adjective, and (2) the true Gen. may be predicative (like an Adj.), and thus apparently construed with a Verb. To give a single example : *θεῶν γόνος ἔστί* might be (theoretically) = *he is offspring from-gods* (Abl.), and on the other hand *θεῶν γέγονε* may be = *he is offspring of-gods* (Gen., see § 148).

147.] The Genitive with Nouns. The manner in which a Genitive serves to define or qualify the 'governing' Noun may be very various. *E.g.* *Τρώων χόλος* may mean *anger of* (i.e. *felt by*) *the Trojans*, or (as in *Il.* 6. 335) *anger at the Trojans*, or *anger on account of the Trojans* (as in *Il.* 15. 138 *χόλον υἱὸς ἔηος* means *anger about the death of his son*). Compare also—

ἔρκος πολέμοιο a bulwark in (or against) war.

ἔρκος δδόντων the fence (made) of teeth.

τέρας μερόπων ἀνθρώπων a sign to men.

λάβρη Λαομέδοντος with secrecy from Laomedon.

βίη ἀέκοντος with force used to one unwilling.

κύματα παντοίων ἀνέμων the waves raised by all winds.

ὀμφαλοι κασσιτεροῖο bosses made of tin.

Ἰλίου πολλέθρον the town of Ilios.

᾽Οἶλῆος ταχύς Αἴας swift Ajax son of Oileus.

δαιμόνιε ξείνων unaccountable stranger !

νομός ἔλης pasture ground in the wood.

νόστος γαίης Φαιήκων return to the land of the Phaeacians.

ὑπόψιος ἄλλων suspected by others.

ἐπίστροφος ἀνθρώπων going about among men.

ἀφνειὸς βιότοιο rich in substance.

ἰθὺς Διομήδεος straight for Diomedes.

The different uses of the Genitive often answer to the different meanings given by the Suffixes which serve to form Adjectives from Nouns (§ 117). Compare, for instance, *Il.* 2. 54 *Νεστορέη παρὰ νηὶ Πυλογενέος βασιλῆος* by the ship of Nestor the Pylian king ; *Il.* 6. 180 *θεῖον γένος οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων* the offspring of gods, not of men ; *τόξον αἰγός* (*Il.* 4. 105) a bow of goat's horn, but *ἀσκὸς αἰγείου* a bag of goatskin ; *᾽Οἶλῆος ταχύς Αἴας* and *Αἴας ᾽Οἰλιάδης* ; *Τελαμώνιος υἱός* the son of Telamon ; and so in the Pronouns, *ἐμεῖο ποθῇ* (*Il.* 6. 362), but *σῇ ποθῇ* (*Il.* 19. 321).

These uses have been classified as Objective and Subjective, Possessive, Partitive, Material, &c. In many cases however the variety of relations expressed by the Gen. eludes this kind of analysis. Such classifications, moreover, are apt to lead us into the fallacy of thinking that relations which are distinct to us, because expressed by different language, were distinctly conceived by those who expressed them all in the same way ;—the fallacy, in

short, of supposing the distinctions of thought to be prior to the language which embodies them.

The relation of the Genitive to the governing Noun is in many ways analogous to the relation of the Accusative to the Verb, and also to that which subsists between the first part of a Compound Noun and the second. In each of these cases the relation is that of a defining or qualifying word to the notion defined or qualified, and it is one which may be of various kinds, as may be suggested by particular combinations of meaning.

Notice, as especially frequent in Homer—

(1) the use of a Gen. after Nouns meaning *grief, anger, &c.*, to express the *object* or *cause* of the feeling: as ἄχος ἡμιόχοιο *grief for the chariot-driver* (Il. 8. 124, 316, &c.), ἄχος σέθεν (Il. 4. 169); ὀδύνη Ἡρακλῆος (Il. 15. 25); πένθος παιδὸς ἀποφθιμένοιο (Il. 18. 88); κῆδε' ἐμῶν ἐτάρων (Il. 22. 272, Od. 11. 382); and so in the much-disputed phrase Ἑλένης ὀρμήματά τε στοναχάς τε (Il. 2. 356, 590), which can only mean *efforts and groans about Helen*.

(2) the 'partitive' use after τίς (Interrog.) and τις (Indef.), often with several words interposed: as Il. 1. 8 τίς τ' ἄρ σφωε θεῶν κτλ.; Il. 1. 88 οὗ τις ἐμεῦ ζῶντος . . . χεῖρας ἐποίσει συμπάντων Δαναῶν *no one shall . . . of all the Greeks*.

The partitive Gen. is also seen in the Homeric phrases δία θεῶν *bright one among goddesses*, δία γυναικῶν, δαίμονιε ξείνων, πάντων ἀριδείκετον ἀνδρῶν (Il. 14. 320): where the governing word implies some kind of distinction or eminence. So when there is a contrast, as—

Il. 11. 761 πάντες δ' εὐχετόωντο θεῶν Διὶ Νέστορι τ' ἀνδρῶν.

148.] **Genitive in the Predicate.** Among the various uses of the Gen. in construction with a Verb the first to be noticed are those in which the Case evidently retains its attributive or adjectival character. This use is rare in Homer: examples are,—αἱματός εἰς ἀγαθοῖο *thou art of good blood*, ἐποίησεν σάκος αἰόλου ἐπαβόειον ταύρων *ζατρεφέων made a shield seven hides thick, of (hides of) goodly bulls*. In classifying the Greek uses of the Gen. the chief object is to separate constructions of this kind (in which the Case is ultimately the adjectival or 'true' Gen.) from those in which it represents an Ablative, and therefore is essentially akin to the Adverbs.

* Prof. Max Müller (*Lectures*, I, p. 103) shows how the Genitive Ending -οιο (for -ο-οιο) may be explained as a Suffix of the same kind as those which form Adjectives from Nouns. If his hypothesis is admitted, the Genitive is simply 'an Adjective without Gender,' in respect of *form* as well as *use*. And even if the identification on which he chiefly relies (of the Case-ending -*sys*a and Suffix -*tya* with the Pronoun *sys*a, *syá*, *tyad*) should be thought open to question, there can be little doubt that the Case is originally 'adnominal' or adjectival in character.

This use of the Gen. is singularly common in Latin: see Roby, § 1282. The reason for this difference between Greek and Latin evidently is that in Latin the Gen. is not confounded with the Abl. The same explanation has been given of the free use which Latin makes of the predicative Dative (§ 143, note).

149.] Genitive of Place. A Gen. expresses a vague local relation (*within, in the sphere of, &c.*), in the following uses:—

(1) After a negative—

Il. 17. 372 νέφος δ' οὐ φαίνεται πάσης γαίης οὐτ' ὀρέων.

Od. 3. 251 ἢ οὐκ Ἄργεος ἦεν Ἀχαιϊκοῦ. Cp. 14. 98., 21. 109.

(2) When two *sides* or *alternative* places are contrasted—

Il. 9. 219 αὐτὸς δ' ἀντίον ἔξεν Ὀδυσσῆος θέλειο

τοίχου τοῦ ἐτέρου. Cp. 24. 598.

Od. 1. 23 Αἰθίοπας, τοὶ διχθὰ δεδαλᾶται, ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν,

οἱ μὲν δυσομένον Ὑπερίονος, οἱ δ' ἀνιόντος,

and so perhaps Od. 12. 27 ἢ ἀλὸς ἢ ἐπὶ γῆς, and Od. 4. 678 αὐλῆς ἐκτὸς ἔων *in the court outside* (cp. 9. 239).

(3) With Verbs of motion, to express the space *within* which the motion takes place, as Il. 2. 785 διέπρησον πεδίοιο *made their way over the plain*: so ἰὼν πολέος πεδίοιο, ἵππω ἀνυζομένω πεδίοιο, πεδίοιο διώκειν, κούιοντες πεδίοιο, &c.; 10. 353 ἐλκόμεναι νειοῖο βαθείης πηκτὸν ἄροτρον: 24. 264 ἵνα πρήσσωμεν ὁδοῖο, cp. Od. 2. 404., 3. 476. This use of the Gen. is almost confined to *set phrases*; accordingly it is only found with the Gen. in -οιο (the archaic form).

The difference of meaning between this Genitive and the Accusative of Space (§ 138) seems to be that the Acc. *measures* the action of the Verb, whereas the Gen. only gives a local relation in which the action stands. When an Acc. of quantity and a Gen. are both used, the Acc. often seems to govern the Gen.; e.g. ὁμίλῳ πολλῶν ἐπελθὼν *advancing far in the throng*, παρεξελθεῖν πεδίοιο τυτθόν *to go a short space of plain beyond*. So with Adverbs: ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθ' ἵθυσε μάχῃ πεδίοιο: ἄδην ἐλάσαι πολέμοιο; and with a negative: οὐκ Ἄργεος ἦεν = *he was nowhere in Argos*. Thus the Gen. has a partitive character.

150.] Genitive of Time. This Gen. expresses a period of time to which the action belongs, without implying anything as to its duration; e.g.—

Od. 14. 161 τοῦδ' αὐτοῦ λυκάβαντος ἐλεύσεται *he will come (some-time in) this very year*. So Il. 5. 523 νηνεμῆς *in calm weather*; 8. 470 ἡὸς *in the morning*; 11. 691 τῶν προτέρων ἐτέων *in former years*; 22. 27 ὁπώρας εἰσι *goes in autumn*.

It appears from the corresponding construction in Sanscr. and

The Gen. in this group of uses is probably akin to the Gen. of the *space within which* action takes place, § 149. Compare, for example, ἐρείσατο γαίης with ἔξε τοίχου τοῦ ἑτέρου,—passages given under the same head by Kühner (§ 418, 8, a). Or it may be Ablatival: cp. πρύμνηθεν λάβε, § 159.

(b) With Verbs meaning *to touch, to hit* (an object aimed at), *to reach* (a person), *to put in or on* (a chariot, ship, wall, &c.), with the derivative meanings, *to attain to, get a place or share in, &c.*; as ἀλλήλων ἐφίκοντο *got at each other*; τύχε γάρ β' ἀμάθοιο βαθείης *he happened to fall in deep sand*; so νεκροὺς πυρκαϊῆς ἐπενήνεον *heaped the corpses on the funeral pile*; so metaphorically, κακῶν ἐπιβασκόμεν *to bring into mischief*; ἀντιάων πολέμοιο *to join in war*, ἀντιῶν ἐκατόμβης (but Il. 1. 31 ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιώσαν because λέχος is the *whole* object, cp. § 136, 1).

(c) With Verbs meaning *to aim at, strive after, desire, care for, complain of, grieve for, be angry about, &c.*; as Αἴαντος ἀκόντισε *threw a dart at Ajax*, οὐ παιδὸς ὀρέξατο *held out his arms for his child*, σκοπέλων ἐπιμαίεο *feel for the rocks* (but ἐπεμαίετο ἵππους *touched up the horses*), ἐπειγόμενος Ἄρης *hasting to (eager for) battle*, τῶν οὐ τι μετατρέπη οὐδ' ἀλεγίσεις *these you do not regard or heed*, Κύκλωπος κεχόλωται *is enraged on behalf of the Cyclops*; and many similar instances.

Kühner (§ 416, *Anm.* 9) quotes Il. 5. 582 χερμαδίῳ ἀγκῶνα τυχῶν μέσον as a use of τυγχάνω with the Acc. But it is possible to construe ἀγκῶνα with βάλε in the earlier part of the sentence.

(d) With Verbs meaning *to hear, perceive, know of, remember, and the like*; the Gen. expressing—

- (1) the *person from whom* sound comes;
- (2) the *person about whom* something is heard, known, &c.
- (3) the *sound heard* (but the Acc. is more usual).

The particular thing heard or known is often indicated by a Participle agreeing with the Genitive: *e.g.*—

Il. 1. 257 εἰ σφῶν τάδε πάντα πυθόλατο μαρναμένοιν (= *if they heard of all this fighting on your part*).

Il. 4. 357 ὥς γνῶ χωμένοιο (= *ὥς ἔγνω αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἔχόετο*).

Od. 2. 220 εἰ δέ κε τεθνηῶτος ἀκούσω: so 4. 728, &c.

The Verb οἶδα, when it means *to know about, to be skilled in, takes a Gen.*, as Il. 11. 657 οὐδέ τι οἶδε πένθεος *knows nothing of the sorrow*. So Od. 21. 506 φόρμιγγος ἐπιστάμενος καὶ ἀοιδῆς: Il. 16. 811 διδασκόμενος πολέμοιο.

So μέμνημαι takes a Gen. when it means *I bethink myself of, am affected by the memory* (Il. 2. 686, Od. 15. 23): see § 140, 4, a. Cp. Lat. *memini* with the Gen. or Acc., perhaps with a similar difference of meaning (Roby, § 1332).

(e) The Gen. of *material*, &c. The construction so termed is found with Verbs that imply the use of a material (especially one of indefinite quantity), a stock drawn upon, &c. *E.g.*—

Il. 1. 470 κούροι μὲν κρητήρας ἐπεστέψαντο ποτοῖο *filled up the cups to the brim with liquor*; 9. 214 πάσσε δ' ἄλός *sprinkled with salt*. So πυρός in the phrases πρῆσαι πυρός *to burn with fire*, πυρός μειλισσέμεν *to propitiate (the dead) with fire*.

Il. 18. 574 χρυσοῖο τετεύχατο *were made of gold*.

Od. 3. 408 ἀποστιβόντες ἀλείφατος *shining with fat*.

And with a distinctly *partitive* force:—

Od. 1. 140 χαριζομένη παρεόντων *favouring him (with good things) from her store*; 9. 102 λωτοῖο φαγών *eating of the lotus*; and so with γένω *to give a taste of*.

Il. 5. 268 τῆς γενεῆς ἔκλεψε *stole (a strain) from the brood*.

9. 580 πεδίοιο ταμέσθαι *to cut off (a τέμενος) from the plain*.

14. 121 Ἀδρήστοιο δ' ἔγγῃε θυγατρῶν *married (one) from the daughters of Adrastus* (so Od. 9. 225., 12. 64., 15. 98).

The Gen. with Verbs meaning *to stint, grudge, spare* is probably of the same nature (*to stint* being = *to give little*).

The Genitives in λούεσθαι ποταμοῖο *to bathe in a river*, χεῖρας νυφάμενος πολῆς ἁλός *washing his hands in the sea*, &c. are intermediate between this group and the Genitives of Space (§ 149).

A Gen. of the *person* may be used with Verbs meaning *to gain profit from*; e.g. Il. 1. 410 ἵνα πάντες ἐπαύρωνται βασιλῆος: 16. 31 τί σευ ἄλλος ὀνήσεται; Od. 11. 452 υἱὸς ἐνυπλησθῆναι (υἱὸς = *the company of his son*): also with πειράομαι *to try* (Od. 8. 23); cp. the Gen. with γένω.

Note also the elliptical expression, Il. 21. 360 τί μοι ἔριδος καὶ ἀρωγῆς *what (share) have I in combat and aid?*

Most of these Genitives are clearly 'partitive,' and all of them can be explained as 'true' Genitives. There is a similar use of the Gen. in Sanscrit with Verbs meaning *to enjoy*, &c. (Delbrück, *A. S.* § 109). Some however may be Ablatives. In particular, the Gen. of *material* with τεύχω, ποιέω, &c. is so regarded by Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 48) on the ground of the Sanscrit use. It may be that in certain cases the original usage allowed either Gen. or Abl., according to the shade of meaning to be expressed; just as with Verbs of *filling* Latin employs the Gen. or the Abl.

(f) With Verbs meaning *to rule, be master*; viz.—

ἀνάσσω, Gen. of the *place* or *thing*, as Il. 1. 38 Τενέδοιό τε Ἴφι ἀνάσσεις: Od. 24. 30 τιμῆς ἧς περ ἄνασσεσ: of the *people*, only Il. 10. 32, Od. 11. 376. The Gen. of the *thing* and Dat. of the *people* combined, Il. 20. 180 Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξειν τιμῆς τῆς Πριάμου. βασιλεύω: Od. 1. 401., 11. 285.

κρατέω: Il. 1. 79 Ἀργείων κρατεῖ *has power over the Argives*.

σημαίνω : Il. 14. 85 στρατοῦ ἄλλου σημαίνειν : so ἡγοῦμαι, &c.

θεμιστεύω : Od. 9. 114 θεμιστεύει δὲ ἕκαστος παίδων ἢδ' ἀλόχων.

It is probable, from the analogy of Sanscrit, that this is the true Gen.; but the original force of the Case is obscure.

152.] **The Ablative Genitive.** The Ablative expressed the object (person, place, or thing) from which separation takes place, and is represented by the Gen. in various uses : as—

ἀνένδν πολιῆς ἁλός *rose from the grey sea.*

χάζοντο κελεύθου *gave way from the path.*

ἔσχοντο μάχης *were stayed from the fight.*

παιδὸς ἐργεῖ μῦθον *keeps off a fly from her child.*

διώκετο οἴο δόμοιο *was chased from his house.*

κακότητος ἔλυσαν *delivered from ill.*

ἀτεμβόμενος ἴσης *defrauded of a share.*

παιδὸς ἐδέξατο *received from her son.*

πίθων ἡφύσσετο οἶνος *wine was drawn from casks.*

Ἀντιλόχοιο λείπετο *was left behind Antilochus.*

γόνυ γονὸς ἀμείβων *exchanging knee past knee (= putting them in front by turns).*

ἄρχομαι *I begin from (a point),* Il. 9. 97, Od. 21. 142.

ἀμαρτάνω *I miss, lose, fail in.*

Τρῶας ἄμυνε νεῶν *keep off the Trojans from the ships : so with ἀλαλκεῖν.*

ἀκούω, πυνθάνομαι, ἔκλυνον *hear from :* see § 151, d.

τεύχω, ποιέω *I make of (material) :* see § 151, e.

For the Gen. with Verbs of *buying, selling, &c.*, see § 153.

Adjectives implying separation (want, freedom, &c.) may take an Ablative Gen. by virtue of their equivalence to Verbs of similar meaning ; or they may be construed as Nouns, that is to say, with a true Gen. *E.g.* λείος πετράων might be *smooth (i.e. cleared) from rocks, or smooth as to rocks.* Cp. the similar Latin Adjectives which take either Abl. or Gen.

The Gen. with Adjectives of *comparison* represents the Ablative (cp. the Latin construction). It expresses the point *from which the higher degree of a quality is separated :* cp. the Gen. with Verbs of *excelling* and *falling behind*, and with Adjectives of similar meaning, as Od. 21. 254 βίης ἐπιδενέες εἰμὲν Ὀδυσῆος *we are wanting in strength behind (compared with) Ulysses.*

In Sanscrit the Abl. is used with numerals to express the point *from which we count.* A trace of this may be seen in the elliptical form δωδεκάτῃ ὅτε κτλ. *the twelfth day (from the day) when &c.* (Il. 21. 81, cp. Od. 3. 180).

The Gen. with ἐξ, ἀπό, παρά, πρὸς, πρό, ὑπέρ, περί (*beyond*), ὑπό (*from under*), κατὰ (*down from*), and the Verbs compounded with them, is Ablative ; with some of the 'improper Prepositions,' as

χωρίς, ἀνευ, τῆλε, ἄτερ, νόσφι, ἀμφίς, ἐκάς, ἐκτός, ἄψ, πάλιν, it may be either the Ablative or the true Genitive. When *motion from* is not implied, the Case is probably the true Gen.; see § 228.

It should be observed that the use of the Ablatival Gen. with simple Verbs is comparatively restricted in Homer. It is not used, as it is in Sanscrit, with simple Verbs of *going, coming, bringing* (e.g. we could not substitute the Gen. for the form in -θεν in such phrases as κλισίηθεν ἰοῦσα, ἀγρόθεν ἐρχομένη, οἰκοθεν ἦγε, Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων, &c.), but only with Verbs which imply *separation or distance from* a point, or which are compounded with Prepositions such as ἐξ, ἀπό, &c.

Later poets seem to be more free in this respect (probably because they treated the usage as an archaism, adopted as being poetical): e.g. Soph. O. T. 142 βάθρον ἴστασθε, Ant. 418 χθονὸς αἰέρας, Phil. 630 νῆς ἄγοντα, &c. Further extensions are,—the use for the place from which something is *seen*, as Soph. El. 78, 324, and for the *agent*, Eur. Or. 497, El. 123.

153.] Gen. of Price. Verbs meaning *to change places with* take an Ablatival Gen., as γόνυ γονυδὸς ἀμείβων (quoted in the last section): hence the constructions—

Π. 6. 235 τεύχε' ἀμειβε χρύσεια χαλκείων *exchanged armour, golden (passing in exchange) for bronze.*

Π. 1. 111 Χρυσήϊδος ἀγλά' ἄποινα . . δέξασθαι *to accept a splendid ransom for Chryseis*; so Od. 11. 327 ἡ χρύσου φίλον ἀνδρὸς ἐδέξατο *who took gold for (to betray) her husband.*

Π. 11. 106 ἔλυσεν ἀπολύων *released for a ransom.*

Hence we may explain the construction with Verbs meaning *to value at, set off against (a price)*; as Π. 23. 649 τιμῆς ἧς τέ μ' εἶοικε τετιμῆσθαι; so with the Adjectives ἀντάξιος, &c.

It is possible however that a word expressing value or price may be construed as a Gen. with a Noun. As we can say τεύχεα ἑκατόμβοια *armour worth a hundred oxen*, we might have τεύχεα ἑκατὸν βοῶν (as in Attic prose, e.g. δέκα μῶν χωρίον *a plot worth ten minae*); cp. the Latin *magni emere, magni facere*, &c.

Case-forms in -φι(ν).

154.] The Case-Ending -φι(ν) is found in a number of Homeric forms which appear to be construed indifferently as Datives or Genitives. It will be shown, however, that there is ground for believing these forms to have been used for the Dat. only in the instrumental and locative senses (the latter being comparatively rare), and for the Gen. only in the ablatival sense. They formed, therefore, a 'mixed Case,' composed of the same elements as the Latin Ablative, viz. the original Instr. Abl. and Loc.

In respect of usage these forms are archaic: that is to say, they are confined for the most part to lines and phrases of a

fixed conventional type. In several instances the survival is evidently due to the influence of the metre: thus δακρύοφι, στήθεοφι take the place of δακρύων, στήθεων; δοτεόφιν and ικριόφιν, of δοτέων, δοτέοισι, and ικριών, ικριόοισι—forms impossible in a hexameter. So δι' ὄρεοφι, κατ' ὄρεοφι, ὑπ' ὄχεοφι, for δι' ὀρέων, κατ' ὀρέων, ὑπ' ὀχέων.

155.] **Instrumental.** The forms in -φι(ν) appear to have been forms of the Instrumental (Sing. and Plur.), and the majority of the Homeric examples may be referred to that Case: ἐτέρηφι *with the other hand* (Il. 16. 734, &c.), δεξιτερῇφι (Od. 19. 480); βίηφι *by force* (Il. 16. 826, Od. 1. 403, &c., and in the phrase κρατερῇφι βίηφι), also *in strength* (βίηφι φέρεteros, Od. 6. 6, &c.); ἀναγκαίηφι δαμέντας (Il. 20. 143); γενεῇφι νεώτατος (Il. 14. 112, &c.): δακρυόφι πλησθεν *were filled with tears* (Il. 17. 696, &c.).

In the 'comitative' use, αὐτοῖσιν ὄχεοφιν *chariot and all*, ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεοφιν *with horses and chariot* (Il. 12. 114, Od. 4. 533); with Prepositions, ἅμ' ἡοὶ φαινομένηφι, σὺν ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεοφιν (often in the Iliad), also παρ' ὄχεοφιν (construed with Verbs of rest, Il. 5. 28, 794., 8. 565., 12. 91., 15. 3)—unless ὄχεοφιν is a Loc. (§ 157); with words expressing agreement, likeness, &c., as παλάμηφι ἀρήρει *fitted his hand*, θεόφιν μήστωρ ἀτάλαντος (Il. 7. 366, &c.).

With Verbs of trusting; Il. 4. 303 ἵπποσύνη τε καὶ ἡγορέηφι πεποισώς; so ἀγλατήφι (Il. 6. 510), βίηφι (several times).

156.] **Ablative.** Forms used as Ablativ Genitives are—

Il. 2. 794 ναῦφι ἀφορμηθεῖεν *start from the ships*.

13. 700 ναῦφι ἀμυνόμενοι *defending the ships* (§ 152).

3. 368 ἐκ δέ μοι ἔγχος ἦτχθη παλάμηφι.

10. 458 ἀπὸ μὲν . . κυνέην κεφαλῇφι ἔλοντο.

Od. 5. 152 δακρυόφιν τέρσοντο *were dried from tears*.

8. 279 καθύπερθε μελαθρόφι ἐξεκέχυντο.

With the Prepositions—

ἐξ: as ἐξ εὐνήφι, ἐκ θεόφι, ἐκ πασσαλόφι, ἐκ ποντόφι, ἐκ στήθεοφι, ἐξ Ἐρέβεοφι, &c.

ἀπό: as ἀπὸ νευρήφι, αὐτόφι, χαλκόφι, στήθεοφι, ναῦφι, &c.

παρά when it means *from*: Il. 12. 225 παρὰ ναῦφι ἐλευσόμεθ' αὐτὰ κέλευθα, Od. 14. 498 παρὰ ναῦφι ἐποτρύνει νέεσθαι. So—

18. 305 παρὰ ναῦφι ἀνέστη δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.

8. 474 πρὶν ὄρθαι παρὰ ναῦφι ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα.

16. 281 ἐλπόμενοι παρὰ ναῦφι ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα
μνηθμόν μὲν ἀπορρῖψαι, φιλόττητα δ' ἐλέσθαι.

In these three places the notion of *leaving* the ships is implied, so παρὰ ναῦφι has the meaning of παρὰ νεῶν.

κατά down from: κατ' ὄρεσφι (Il. 4. 452., 11. 493).

ὑπό from under: ὑπ' ὄχεσφι (Il. 23. 7), ὑπὸ ζυγόφιν (Il. 24. 576).

With this use of -φι we may compare the use of the *Dative* with ἐξ and ἀπό, which is one of the peculiarities of the Arcadian and Cyprian dialects (Meister, ii. 119, 296). The parallel of the Latin Abl. has been noticed.

157.] Locative. This use is found in several clear instances, as well as others of an indecisive kind:—

Il. 19. 323 Φθίῃφι in *Phthia*; Il. 13. 168 κλισίῃφι λέλειπτο *was left in the tent*; θύρῃφι out of doors, foris (Od. 9. 238., 22. 220); κεφαλῇφι ἔθηκε *put on the head* (Il. 10. 30, 257, 261; cp. 496, Od. 20. 94); Il. 11. 474 ὥς εἴ τε δαφνοῖσι θήρες ὄρεσφι: 19. 376 τὸ δὲ καλεῖται ὕψοθ' ὄρεσφι: 22. 139 ἦύτε κίρκος ὄρεσφι κτλ.; 22. 189 ὥς δ' ὅτε νεβρὸν ὄρεσφι κυῶν κτλ.; Il. 2. 480 ἦτε βοῦς ἀγέλῃφι μέγ' ἕξοχος ἔπλετο πάντων: 16. 487 ἀγέλῃφι μετελθὼν *coming into the herd*.

With the Prepositions:—ἐν, as Il. 24. 284 ἐν χειρὶ . . δεξιτερῇφι (= Od. 15. 148): πρὸς, in Od. 5. 432 πρὸς κοτυληδονόφιν (*sticking*) *to the suckers*: ἀμφί, in Od. 16. 145 φθινύθει δ' ἀμφ' ὀστεόφι χρώς: ὑπό, in ὑπ' ὄχεσφι, ὑπὸ ζυγόφι (Il. 19. 404, unless the meaning is *from under*).

With ἐπὶ on, at, in the combinations ἐπὶ ἱκριόφιν, ἐπ' ἐσχαρόφιν, ἐπὶ νευρήφιν (all in the Od.) the Case may be Loc. or Gen.

παρ' αὐτόφι occurs four times in the *Iliad* (12. 302., 13. 42., 20. 140., 23. 640). In three of these places there is a v. l. παρ' αὐτόθι (or παραντόθι), which generally gives a better sense, and which is required by the grammar in 13. 42 ἔλποντο δὲ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν αἰρήσειν κτενέειν τε παρ' αὐτόφι (= παρὰ νηυσί). So 19. 255 ἐπ' αὐτόφιν ἦτο σιγῇ where αὐτόθι (Nauck) is probably right. It seems that the Endings -θι and -φι were confused, possibly at a very early period.

158.] The true Dat. and Gen. There is only one example of the true Dat., viz. Il. 2. 363 ὥς φρήτρη φρήτρηφι ἀρήγη, φύλα δὲ φύλοισι *that phratRIA may bear aid to phratRIA, and tribe to tribe*.

The instances of the true Gen. are—

(1) Il. 21. 295 κατὰ Ἰλίοφι κλυτὰ τεῖχεα λαὸν ἐέλσαι *to coop up the army within the famous walls of Ilios*.

(2) Il. 21. 367 τεῖρε δ' αὖτμῃ Ἥφαίστοιο βίῃφι πολύφρονος *the breath of Hephaestus* (Ἥφαίστοιο βίῃ) *wore him out*.

(3) Od. 12. 45 πολλὸς δ' ἀμφ' ὀστεόφιν θῖς ἀνδρῶν πνυθόμενων *there is around a great heap of bones, of men rotting*. But this may be an Instr. of material, = 'a heap (is made) of bones.'

(4) Il. 16. 762 κεφαλῇφι ἐπεὶ λάβεν οὐχὶ μεθίει (Gen., § 151, a); and 11. 350 οὐδ' ἀφάμαρτε τιτυσκόμενος κεφαλῇφι (but the Gen. might be construed with ἀφάμαρτε, as an Abl.).

(5) Certain uses with Prepositions; viz. ἐπὶ in Il. 13. 308 ἡ ἐπὶ δεξιόφω . . ἡ ἐπ' ἀριστερόφω *towards right or left*; πρόσθε in Il. 5. 107 πρόσθ' ἵπποιον καὶ ὄχεσφω: διὰ *through*, in διὰ δὲ στήθεσφω ἔλασεν (Il. 5. 41, &c.), also 10. 185 ἔρχηται δι' ὄρεσφω.

The first four of these references evidently do not prove much. The first would be a clear instance of the true Gen. if we could be sure of the text: but there is some probability in favour of Ἰλίοο (§ 98), proposed by Leo Meyer (*Decl.* p. 35). In Il. 21. 367 we may perhaps take βίηφι as an Instr.: *hot breath vexed him through (by reason of) the might of Hephaestus*.

Again, the use with ἐπὶ may be locative, with πρόσθε ablative (as with πρό). The uses with διὰ are more important, because they are not isolated, but form a distinct group. It is improbable that διὰ *through* should take an ablative Gen. or a Locative. The Sanscrit Instr. is used of the space or time *over which* an action extends (Delbrück, *A. S.* § 88): and so the Abl. in Latin (Roby, §§ 1176, 1189). This use appears in Greek as the Dat. of the *way by which*, and perhaps in the phrases περιῶντι τῷ θέρε, &c. It may be thought possible that δι' ὄρεσφω and διὰ στήθεσφω are fragments of this use. If so, one or two other uses assigned above to the Loc. may be really Instr.; especially ὄρεσφω, Il. 11. 474, 22. 139, 189.

On the other hand, if the forms in -φι(ν) constitute a 'mixed Case' (Locative, Instrumental, and Ablative), there must have been a tendency to extend its sphere from the Loc. and Instr. to the Dat., and from the Abl. to the Gen. Thus the few instances of forms in -φι(ν) standing for the true Dat. and Gen. may be first steps towards an amalgamation of five Cases (such as we have in the Greek Dual). One or two are probably among the 'false archaisms' which doubtless exist in Homer, though not to the extent supposed by some commentators: see § 216.

Forms in -θεν and -ως.

159.] The Ending -θεν expresses the point *from which* motion takes place; hence it is common in construction with Verbs of motion, and after the Prepositions ἐξ and ἀπό. Cp. also—

Il. 3. 276 Ζεὺ πάτερ Ἰδηθεν μεδέων *ruling from Ida*.

8. 397 Ἰδηθεν ἐπεὶ ἶδε *when he saw, looking from Ida*.

15. 716 Ἐκτωρ δὲ πρύμνηθεν ἐπεὶ λάβε *when he had got hold from (i.e. in the direction from, beginning with) the stern*; so ἐτέρωθεν *on the other side*, ἀμφοτέρωθεν *on both sides*.

Of time; ἠῶθεν *from (beginning with) dawn*.

In a metaphorical sense; of an *agent* (regarded as the source of action), as Il. 15. 489 Διόθεν βλαφθέντα βέλεμνα: Od. 16. 447 οὐδὲ τί μιν θάνατον τρομέεσθαι ἄνωγα ἔκ γε μνηστήρων θεόθεν δ' οὐκ ἔστ' ἀλέασθαι. Also, Il. 10. 68 πατρόθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων *naming from (on the side of) the father*. And in two phrases, Il. 7. 39, 226 οἴσθεν οἶος *quite alone*, and Il. 7. 97 αἰνóθεν αἰνώς *quite terribly*,—where the force of the Ending is indistinct.

It is to be observed that (except in the Personal Pronouns) this form is not found with Verbs meaning to *deprive of*, *free*

from, defend, surpass, or with the corresponding Adjectives and Adverbs. Hence it cannot be held to be equivalent to an Ablative (§ 152), and probably differed from the Abl. in expressing *motion from* rather than *separation*.

On the other hand, the Pronominal forms ἐμέθεν, σέθεν, ἔθεν are freely construed—

(1) as Ablatives: πρὸ ἔθεν, ὑπὲρ σέθεν, ἀνεν ἐμέθεν; and with a Comparative, Il. 1. 114 οὗ ἔθεν ἐστι χερσίων, &c. Cp. also Il. 9. 419 μάλα γὰρ ἔθεν . . χεῖρα ἐὴν ὑπερέσχε.

(2) as true Genitives: Il. 4. 169 ἀλλὰ μοι αἰνὸν ἄχος σέθεν ἔσσειται *I shall have terrible grief for thee*; with Verbs of *hearing* (Il. 2. 26, &c.), *remembering* (Od. 4. 592), *caring* (Il. 1. 180 σέθεν δ' ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀλεγίζω), *reaching* or *touching* (ἀντιάζω, πειράζω, &c.): and with ἄσσουν, πρόσθε, ἄντα, ἀντίον, ἔνεκα, ἔκητι.

160.] The Ending -ως is generally derived from the Ablative of Stems in -ο (§ 110), although -ὄτ would not regularly become -ως, and the transition of meaning is not a very easy one. The chief examples in common use in Homer are—

From Pronominal Stems: ὧς, τῶς, πῶς, ὁμῶς, αὐτως, ἄλλως.

From Stems in -ο: αἰνῶς, ἀσπασίως, ἐκπάγλως, ἐπισταμένως, θαρσαλέως, κακῶς, καρπαλίμως, κραιπνῶς, κρατερῶς, ὀτραλέως, πυκινῶς, ῥηϊδίως, στερεῶς, στυγερῶς, χαλεπῶς, μεγάλως, καλῶς, αἰσchrῶς, φίλως.

From other Stems: πάντως, λιγέως, ἀτρεκέως, ἀσφαλέως, ἀφραδέως, περιφραδέως, διηνεκέως, ἐνδυκέως, νωλεμέως, προφρονέως, ἐπικρατέως, ταχέως.

It will be seen that comparatively few of these Adverbs come from the *short familiar* Adjectives. Thus καλῶς, αἰσchrῶς, μεγάλως, ταχέως, φίλως are very rare in Homer; and there is no Adverb of the kind from δεινός, ἴσος, ὀρθός, βαρύς, ἄκνυς, ὀξύς.

The Nominative.

161.] **Impersonal Verbs.** It is evident that in a language which distinguishes the Person and Number of the Verb by the Ending, it is not essential that there should be a distinct word as Nominative. ἐσ-τί (*e.g.*) stands for *he is, she is, it is*; the person or thing meant by the Ending may be left to be gathered from the context. In certain cases, however, the Subject meant by an Ending of the Third Person is too indefinite to be expressed by a particular Noun, such as the context could supply to the mind. For instance, in the sentence οὕτως ἐσ-τί *it is so*, the real Subject given by the Ending -τι (in English by the word *it*) is not a particular thing already mentioned or implied, but a vague

notion—‘the case,’ ‘the course of things,’ &c.* Verbs used with a vague unexpressed Subject of this kind are called IMPERSONAL.

The vague Subject may be a Plural, as Il. 16. 128 οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλονται *the case no longer allows of flight*, Od. 2. 203 ἴσα ἔσσεται *things will be even*.

A Neuter Pronoun used as the Subject sometimes gives a vague meaning, not far removed from that of an Impersonal Verb; e.g. Il. 1. 564 εἰ δ' οὕτω τοῦτ' ἐστὶ *if this is so* (cp. οὕτως ἐστὶ *it is so*); ἐσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυκται *it is a good thing too*.

An Impersonal Verb is often followed by an Infinitive, or dependent Clause, which supplies the want of a Subject. See § 234, 2.

162.] Nominative in the Predicate. In certain cases the Predicate of a sentence may be limited or modified by a Nominative in agreement with the Subject. This is especially found—

1. With Adjectives of *time*; as ἐσπέριοι ἀφίκοντο *they came in the evening*, ἐννύχιος προμολῶν *coming forth by night*, εὐδον παννύχιοι *slept all night*, χθιζὸς ἔβη *went yesterday*.

Such Adjectives seem to answer most nearly to the Gen. of time *within* which, but may also express *duration*, as πανημέριος and παννύχιος.

2. In describing the *attitude, manner, position, &c.* in which an action is done: as παλινωρσος ἀπέστη *stood off with a start backwards*, ὕπτιος οἴδει ἐρείσθη *was dashed face upwards on the ground*; so πεζὸς εἰλήλουθα, λαβρὸς ἐπαιγίζων, πρόφρων τέτληκας (cp. προφρονέως), ἀμετροέπης ἔκολα, &c.

3. The Pronouns ὅδε and κεῖνος are sometimes used instead of Adverbs of place: Il. 5. 604 καὶ νῦν οἱ πάρα κεῖνος Ἄρης *now too yonder is Ares at his side*; 10. 434 Θρηίκες οἷδ' ἀπάνευθε *here are the Thracians apart*; Od. 6. 276 τίς δ' ὅδε Ναυσικάα ἔπεται; *So οἷτος* in Il. 10. 82 τίς δ' οἷτος κτλ.

4. With Verbs meaning *to be, to become, to appear, to be made, called, thought, &c.*; as κάρτιστοι τράφεν *they were nurtured the mightiest*, (i.e. *to be the mightiest*); εἰσωποὶ ἐγένοντο νεῶν *they came to be in front of the ships*: ἦδε ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή *this appeared the best counsel*.

In all such cases the Nominative which goes with the Verb not only qualifies the notion given by the Verb-Stem, but also becomes itself a Predicate (i.e. the assertion of an attribute). E.g. κάρτιστοι τράφεν implies that they were κάρτιστοι. A Noun so used is called a SECONDARY Predicate.

The use of εἰμί as the ‘logical copula’ is merely a special or ‘singular’ case

* See Riddell's *Digest*, §§ 95-100: Sigwart, *Impersonalien*.

of this type of sentence. The Verb has then little or no meaning of its own, but serves to mark the following Noun as a Predicate. The final stage of the development is reached when the Verb is omitted as being superfluous.

5. With Impersonal or half-Impersonal Verbs meaning *to be*, &c.; the Predicate being—

(a) a Neuter Adjective; as μόρσιμόν ἐστι *it is fated*; νεμεσσητὸν δέ κεν εἴη *it would be worthy of indignation*; οὐ τοι ἀεικές *it is not unmeet for thee*: with a Pronominal Subject, ἐσθλὸν γὰρ τὸ τέτυκται *it is a good thing*.

In the Plural, οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλονται *there is no more escaping*; cp. λοίγια ἔργα τὰδ' ἔσσεται *this will be a pestilent business*.

In one or two instances the Adverbial form in -ως is used in phrases of this kind: Il. 11. 762 ὧς ἔον εἴ ποτ' ἔον γε *such I was if I was*; Il. 9. 551 Κουρήτεσσι κακῶς ἦν *things went ill for the Curetes*; Il. 7. 424 διαγνῶναι χαλεπῶς ἦν *it was hard to distinguish*; Il. 11. 838 πῶς τ' ἄρ' ἔοι τάδε ἔργα; Od. 11. 336 πῶς ὕμνιν ἀνὴρ ὄδε φαίνεται εἶναι. This may be regarded as older than the Neut. Nominative, since it indicates that the Verb is not a mere 'copula,' but has a meaning which the Adverb qualifies. Cp. Il. 6. 131 δὴν ἦν *lived long* (= δηναῖος ἦν): also the Adverbial Neut. Plur., as Thuc. 1. 25. 4 ὄντες . . ὁμοία, 3. 14. 1 ἴσα καὶ ἰκέται ἐσμέν.

(b) an abstract Noun; as Il. 17. 556 σοὶ μὲν δὴ Μενέλαε κατηφείη καὶ ὄνειδος ἔσσεται εἰ κτλ. *to thee it will be a humbling and reproach if &c.*; οὐ νέμεσις *it is no wrong*; οὐκ ἄρα τις χάρις ἦεν *it was no matter of thanks*; εἰ δέ μοι αἴσα *but if it is my fate*: with a Pronominal Subject, λῶβη τάδε γ' ἔσσεται *this will be a shame*.

The use of an abstract Noun instead of an Adjective is a license or boldness of language of which we have already had examples; see § 116 and § 126.

It is worth while to notice the tendency to import the ideas of *obligation, necessity, &c.* into these phrases: e.g. οὐ νέμεσις *it is not (worthy of, a matter of) indignation*, ὄνειδος ἔσσεται *it will be (ground of) reproach*. So in Latin *vestra existimatio est* = *it is matter for your judgment*.

The Latin idiom called the Predicative Dative (Roby, Pt. II. pp. xxv-lvi) may be regarded as a less violent mode of expression than this Nom., since the Dat. is a case which is originally 'adverbial,' i. e. construed with the Predicate given by the Verb-Stem. In other words, *dedecori est* is a less bold and probably more primitive way of saying *it is disgraceful* than *dedecus est*; just as κακῶς ἦν is more primitive than κακὸν ἦν.

6. The ordinary use of the Participle belongs to this head: as διαστήτην ἐπὶσσαντε *parted after having quarrelled*. In this use the Participle qualifies the Verb-Stem, and at the same time makes a distinct assertion: see Chapter X.

163.] **Interjectional Nominative.** The Nom. is not unfrequently used in Homer without any regular construction, as a kind of exclamation: *e.g.*—

Il. 5. 405 σοὶ δ' ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἀνῆκε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη,
νῆπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδε κτλ. *fool! he knows not &c.*

Similarly σχέτλιος *cruel!* δύσμορος *the unhappy one!* (Od. 20. 194): and so Il. 1. 231 δημοβόρος βασιλεύς! Cp. the interjectional use of αἰδώς *shame!* (Il. 5. 787., 13. 95., 16. 422).

A similar account may be given of one or two passages in which commentators generally suppose 'anacoluthon': viz.—

Il. 10. 436 τοῦ δὴ καλλίστους ἵππους ἴδον ἥδὲ μεγίστους
λευκότεροι χιόνος, θέλειν δ' ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοιοί
whiter than snow they are! &c.; and so in the equally abrupt—

Il. 10. 547 αἰνῶς ἀκτίνεσσιν ἑοικότες ἠελίοιο.

2. 353 ἀστράπτων ἐπιδέξι' ἐναίσιμα σήματα φαίνων (*he did so I tell you*) *by lightning on the right &c.*

Od. 1. 51 νῆσος δεινδρήεσσα, θεὰ δ' ἐνὶ δώματα ναεῖ *an island (it is) well wooded, and a goddess has her dwelling there!*

These forms of expression, when we seek to bring them under the general laws of the grammatical Sentence, resolve themselves into *Predicates with an unexpressed Subject*. On the logical Propositions of this kind see Sigwart (*Logic*, I. p. 55). The Predicate, he shows, is always expressed in a word (or words); but the Subject, when it is of the kind which would be expressed by a Pronoun (*it, this, &c.*) may be indicated by a gesture. The simplest examples of the type are the imperfect sentences used by children, such as *horse!* for *this is a horse*. When such sentences are introduced into literary language, they give it an abrupt and interjectional character, as in the examples quoted. We might add the phrases such as οὐ νέμεσις *it is no wrong* (§ 162), in which the want of a Verb makes the expression somewhat interjectional. Compare, for instance, οὐ νέμεσις with αἰδώς, Ἀργεῖοι *shame on you, Greeks!* also the so-called ellipse in commands, as ἀλλ' ἄνα *but up!*

The Vocative.

164.] Regarding the use of the Vocative in Homer the chief point to be noticed is the curious one (common to Greek and Sanscrit) that when two persons are addressed, connected by τε, the second name is put in the Nominative.* For instance—

Il. 3. 277 Ζεῦ πάτερ Ἰδῆθεν μεδέων κύδιστε μέγιστε,
Ἥελιος θ' ὅς κτλ.

Similarly, the Vocative is not followed by δέ or any similar Conjunction, but the Pronoun σύ is interposed; as Il. 1. 282 Ἀτρεΐδῃ σὺ δὲ παῖε κτλ. *but, son of Atreus, cease &c.*

* Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 28.

The Nominative is often used for the Voc., especially, it would seem, in order to avoid the repetition of the Voc.; *e.g.* Il. 4. 189 φίλος ὦ Μενέλαε. On this point however it is not always possible to trust to the accuracy of the text. Cobet (*Misc. Crit.* p. 333) has good grounds in the metre for proposing to change a great many Vocatives into Nominatives: *e.g.*—

Il. 23. 493 Αἴαν Ἰδομενεῦ τε (read Αἴας Ἰδομενεύς τε).

Il. 2. 8 οὔλε ὄνειρε (read οὔλος).

Od. 8. 408 χαῖρε πάτερ ὦ ξεῖνε (read πατήρ).

Il. 18. 385 τίπτε Θέτι τανύπεπλε ἰκάνεις (Θέτις Zenod.).

Adjectival Use of the Noun.

165.] **Substantive and Adjective.** This seems a convenient place for one or two remarks on the distinction expressed by these terms.

It will be seen from §§ 114 and 117 that there is no general difference in the mode of forming Substantives and Adjectives. Certain Suffixes, however, are chiefly or wholly employed in the formation of *abstract* and *collective* Nouns: as in the Feminine Nouns in -τι-s, -τυ-s, -δων, the Neuters in -μα(τ), the Denominatives in -της (Gen. -τητ-os).

In respect of meaning and use the distinction between the *concrete* Substantives and Adjectives is practical rather than logical. Certain Nouns are mainly used as qualifying words in agreement with other Nouns; these are classed as Adjectives. In such combinations as βούς ταῦρος, ἄνδρες ἀλφεισταί, χαλκῆς ἄνδρες, βασιλεὺς Κῦρος, Ἀγαμέμνων Ἀτρεΐδης, where the qualifying word is one that is not generally used as an Adjective, we speak of the 'adjectival use' of a Substantive. Conversely, when an Adjective stands by itself to denote an individual or group of objects, the use is called 'substantival': *e.g.* κακός *a base fellow*, κακά *evils*, τυκτὸν κακόν *a made mischief*. This is a use which arises when the objects to which an Adjective applies are such as *naturally* form a distinct class. Thus the Suffixes which form Nouns in -τη-s, -τηρ, -τωρ and -εως are practically confined to Substantives.

Abstract and Collective Nouns, it is evident, are essentially Substantives. Thus there is a clear distinction, both in form and meaning, between Abstract and Concrete Nouns; but not between Substantives and Adjectives.

The common definition of an Adjective as a word that expresses 'quality' ('Adjectives express the notion of QUALITY,' Jelf, ii. p. 7) is open to the objections (1) that an abstract Substantive may be said to express quality, and (2) that every concrete Noun of which the etymological meaning is clear

expresses quality in the same way as an Adjective. *E.g.* the definition does not enable us to distinguish *μαχητής* from *μαχημων*.

It is evident that the use of a Nominative in the Predicate—as *βασιλεύς ἐστι* *he is king*—is strictly speaking an adjectival use.

The corresponding distinction in the Pronouns does not need much explanation. The Personal Pronouns are essentially Substantives (being incapable of serving as limiting or descriptive words); the Possessive Pronouns are essentially Adjectives. The others admit of both uses; *e.g.* *οὗτος* *this one*, and *ἄνθρωπος οὗτος* (in Attic *ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος*) *this man*.

166.] Gender of Adjectives. In a few cases the Gender of the Adjective is independent of the Substantive with which it is construed.

1. When a *person* is described by a word which properly denotes a *thing* (viz. a Neuter, as *τέκνον*, *τέκος*, &c., or an abstract Noun, *βίη* *Πριάμοιο*, &c.), the concord of Gender is not always observed. Thus we have *φίλε τέκνον* (but *φίλον τέκος*, *φίλη κεφαλή*); again—

Il. 11. 690 *ἐλθὼν γάρ ῥ' ἐκάκωσε βίη Ἡρακλεΐη* (= *Heracles*).

Od. 11. 90 *ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχῇ Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο*
χρύσειον σκῆπτρον ἔχων.

In such cases grammarians speak of a 'construction according to the meaning' (*κατὰ σύνεσιν*). The term is unobjectionable, provided that we remember that constructions according to the meaning are generally older than those in which meaning is overridden by idiom or grammatical analogy.

2. Where an Adjective refers to more than one Noun, it follows the most prominent: or (if this is at all doubtful) the Masc. is used of *persons*, the Neut. of *things*: *e.g.*—

Il. 2. 136 *αἱ δὲ που ἡμέτεραί τ' ἄλοχοι καὶ νήπια τέκνα*
ἦατ' ἐνὶ μεγάροις ποτιδέγμεναι

because the wives are chiefly thought of: but—

Il. 18. 514 *τείχος μὲν ῥ' ἄλοχοί τε φίλαι καὶ νήπια τέκνα*
ῥύατ' ἐφρεστώτες, μετὰ δ' ἄνδρες οὓς ἔχε γῆρας

because the boys and old men are also in the speaker's mind.

Od. 13. 435 *ἀμφὶ δέ μιν ῥάκος ἄλλο κακὸν βάλεν ἠδὲ χιτῶνα,*
ῥωγαλέα ῥυπόωντα.

The Neut. Plur. is especially used of sheep and cattle: Il. 11. 244 *πρῶθ' ἑκατὸν βοὺς δῶκεν, ἔπειτα δὲ χίλι' ὑπέστη, αἶγας ὁμοῦ καὶ οἷς*; Il. 11. 696 *ἐκ δ' ὁ γέρον ἀγέλην τε βοῶν καὶ πῶϊ μέγ' οἶῶν* *εἴλετο, κρινάμενος τριηκόσι' ἠδὲ νομῆας* (*three hundred head*): cp. also Il. 5. 140, Od. 12. 332.

3. A Noun standing as Predicate may be Neuter, although the Subject is Masc. or Fem.: as *οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη*. This is a kind of substantival use.

167.] **Gender of Pronouns.** A substantival Pronoun denoting a *person* may retain its proper Gender although the antecedent is a Neuter, or an abstract word; as Il. 22. 87 φίλον θάλος, *ὃν τέκον αὐτή*.

Conversely a Neuter Pronoun may be used substantivally of a *thing* which has been denoted by a Masc. or Fem. word:

Il. 2. 873 *ὃς καὶ χρῦσον ἔχωι· πόλεμόνδ' ἔην ἥτε κούρη, νήπιος, οὐδέ τί οἱ τό γ' ἐπῆρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον.*

Cp. Il. 11. 238., 18. 460, Od. 12. 74 (with the note in Merry and Riddell's edition).

On the other hand, a Pronominal Subject sometimes follows the Gender of a Noun standing as Predicate, as αὕτη δίκη ἐστὶ *this is the manner*, ἥ θέμις ἐστὶ *which is right*. But the Neuter is preferred if a distinct object is meant by the Pronoun; as Od. 1. 226 οὐκ ἔρανος τάδε γ' ἐστὶ *what I see is not a club-feast*.

168.] **Implied Predication.** An Adjective (or Substantive in an adjectival use) construed with a Noun in an oblique Case may be so used as to convey a distinct predication; as οὐκέτ' ἐμοὶ φίλα ταῦτ' ἀγορεύεις = *this (that you now speak) is not pleasing to me*.

So after Verbs meaning *to make, cause to be, call, think, &c.*; λαοὺς δὲ λίθους ποίησε Κρονίων *Zeus made the people (to be) stones*.

This use is parallel to that of the Nominative in the Predicate (§ 162): cp. the forms of sentence λαοὶ ἐγένοντο λίθοι, λαοὺς ἐποίησε λίθους. In the latter the predicative Noun (λίθους) is construed with an oblique Case, instead of with the Subject. A Noun so used is called a **TERTIARY PREDICATE**: cp. § 162, 3.

CHAPTER VIII.

USE OF THE NUMBERS.

169.] **Collective Nouns.** The Subject of a Plural Verb may be expressed by means of a Collective Noun; as ὥς φάσαν ἡ πλῆθὺς *thus they said, the multitude* (cp. Il. 15. 305., 23. 157).

Conversely, a Participle construed with a Collective Noun and Singular Verb may be Plural: as Il. 18. 604 περιττοῖσθ' ὄμιλος τερπόμενοι. Cp. Il. 16. 281 ἐκίνηθεν δὲ φάλαγγες ἐλπόμενοι, also Od. 11. 15.

In these instances, again, the construction is said to be 'according to the meaning' (§ 166). The principle is evidently that an abstract or collective word may be used in 'apposition' to a concrete word. It may be noticed however that the com-

binations such as ὄμιλος - τερπόμενοι are only found when there is some pause between the words; otherwise the Genitive would be used (construed as in Τρώων κατεδύσεθ' ὄμιλον, &c.).

170.] Distributive use of the Singular. The word ἕκαστος is often used in the Sing. with a Plural Verb, as ἔβαν οἰκόνδε ἕκαστος *they went home, each one*, δεδμήμεσθα ἕκαστος *we are each one obedient*. Other words in a clause may follow ἕκαστος in respect of Number: as Il. 2. 775 ἵπποι δὲ παρ' ἄρμασιν οἷσιν ἕκαστος *the horses each beside his chariot*; Il. 9. 656 οἱ δὲ ἕκαστος ἑλὼν δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον σπείσαντες παρὰ νῆας ἴσαν πάλιν. Even the Verb is made Sing. in Il. 16. 264 οἱ δ' ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἔχοντες πρόσσω πᾶς πέτεται καὶ ἀμύνει οἷσι τέκεσσι: but this is a slight boldness of expression.

On the same principle we may explain the Sing. in Od. 4. 300 αἱ δ' ἴσαν ἐκ μεγάρου δᾶος μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχουσαι (= *each with a torch in her hands*); Il. 13. 783 τετυμμένω κατὰ χεῖρα (*each of the two*) wounded in the hand; Il. 3. 235 οὓς κεν ἐν γνοίῃν καὶ τ' οὐνομα μυθησάμην. So in Il. 17. 260 τῶν δ' ἄλλων τίς κεν . . οὐνόματ' εἴποι we should doubtless read οὐνομα (Feίποι).

Similarly the Dual is used of a group of *pairs*:—

Il. 16. 370 πολλοὶ δ' ἐν τάφρῳ ἐρυσάρματες ὥkees ἵπποι ἄξαντ' ἐν πρώτῳ ῥυμῷ λίπον ἄρματ' ἀνάκτων where the Dual ἄξαντε (like the Sing. ῥυμῷ) refers to *one* chariot. Probably, too, we should read ἄρμα ἀνάκτων (*i.e.* Φανάκτων). So Il. 23. 362 οἱ δ' ἅμα πάντες ἐφ' ἵπποιῦν μαστιγὰς ἀείραν, Od. 20. 348 ὅσσε δ' ἄρα σφέων δακρυόφιν πίμπλαντο, also Il. 9. 503, Od. 19. 444.

The Dual is often used in this way in Aristophanes: cp. Av. 622 ἀνατείνοντες τὰ χεῖρε, and other instances given by Bieber (*De duali numero*, p. 44).

In Il. 5. 487 μή πως ὥς ἀφίσι λίνου ἀλόντε πανάγρου, the Dual ἀλόντε is explained by Schol. Β ὑμεῖς καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες. If so, it is a distributive use: 'see that ye be not taken, man and wife in one net.' But more probably it refers to Hector and Paris.

In speaking of the characteristics of a group or class it is common to pass from the Plural to the Singular, or *vice versa*; e.g. Od. 4. 691 ἦ τ' ἐστὶ δίκη θείων βασιλῆων, ἄλλον κ' ἐχθαίρῃσι βροτῶν κτλ. *it is the way of kings, (a king) will hate one &c.*; and in the same clause, Il. 10. 259 ῥύεται δὲ κάρη θαλερῶν αἰζῶν (of a kind of helmet); Il. 2. 355 πρὶν τινα παρ Τρώων ἀλόχῳ κατακοιμηθῆναι *beside the wife of some Trojan*; Il. 19. 70 ἀλλὰ τιν' οἶω . . ὑπ' ἑγχεος ἡμετέροιο *before the spear of one of us*. The distributive τίς is equivalent to a Plural.

Hence a peculiar *vague* use of the Plural, as Il. 3. 49 νυὸν ἀνδρῶν ἀλχητῶν *the bride of some warrior's son* (lit. *daughter-in-*

law of warriors, i.e. of this or that warrior); 4. 142 παρήϊον ἔμμεναι ἱππων (v. l. ἱππῳ); 21. 499 πληκτίζεσθ' ἀλόχοισι Διός (less directly personal than ἀλόχῳ).

171.] Plural of Things. The Plural form is not confined in Greek (or indeed in any language) to the expression of 'plurality' in the strict sense, *i.e.* to denote a group composed of distinct individuals, but is often used (esp. in Homer) of objects which it is more logical to think of in the Singular. Many words, too, are used both in the Sing. and the Plur., with little or no difference of meaning.

Notice especially the uses of the Plural in the case of—

(1) Objects consisting of parts: τόξον and τόξα *bow and arrows*: ὄχος and ὄχεια, ἄρμα and ἄρματα *a chariot*: δῶμα, μέγαρον *a hall or room*, δώματα, μέγαρα *a house*: λέκτρον and λέκτρα *a bed*.

πύλαι *a gate* is only used in the Plur.; θύρη is used as well as θύραι, but only of the door of a room (θάλαμος).

(2) Natural objects of undefined extent: ψάμαθος and ψάμαθοι (as we say *sands*), ἅλεις (once ἅλς) *salt*, κονίη and κονίαι *dust*, πυρός and πυροί *wheat*, ῥέεθρον and ῥέεθρα, κύμα (in a collective sense) and κύματα, δάκρυ and δάκρυα, κρέα (seldom κρέας) *meat*, σάρκες (once Sing.) *flesh*.

(3) Parts of the body: νῶτον (or νῶτος—the Nom. Sing. does not occur in Homer) and νῶτα, στήθος and (more commonly) στήθεα, πρόσωπον and πρόσωπα *the countenance*, φρήν and φρένες.

(4) Abstract words: λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων *forgetting horsemanship*, ποδωκείησι πεποιθώς *trusting to speed of foot*, ἀναλκείησι δαμέντες *overcome by want of prowess*, πολυῖδρείησι νόοιο *through cunning of understanding*: so ἀτασθαλῖαι, ἀπραδῖαι, ἀγνηορῖαι, ἀσειφροσύναι, τεκτοσύναι, μεθημοσύναι, &c.; note also προδοκαὶ ἀμβυσή, προχοαὶ *mouth of a river*, δῶρα *gift* (Il. 20. 268 χρῦσος γὰρ ἐρύκακε, δῶρα θεοῖο), κυνῶν μέληθηρα *the sport of dogs*, φυκτὰ *escaping*, ἴσα *fairness* (§ 161).

The Plural in such cases is a kind of imperfect abstraction; the particular manifestations of a quality are thought of as units in a *group* or *mass*,—not yet as forming a single *thing*.

(5) Collective words: μῆλα *flocks*; so πρόβατα is only Plur. in Homer (cp. πρόβασις Od. 2. 75).

(6) Pronouns and Adjectives; see the examples of adverbial uses, §§ 133, 134; cp. also § 161.

172.] Neuter Plural. The construction of the Neut. Plur. with a Singular Verb is the commoner one in Homer, in the proportion of about three to one. When the Plural is used, it will

generally be found that the word is really Plural in meaning (*i. e.* that it calls up the notion of distinct units). Thus it is used with—

Nouns denoting agents; as *ἔθνεα* applied to the men of the Greek army (Il. 2. 91, 464), to birds (Il. 2. 459), to swine (Od. 14. 73); so with *φῶλ' ἀνθρώπων* (Od. 15. 409).

Distinctly plural parts of the body: *περὰ, χεῖλεα, οὐατα, μέλεα*: so *πέδιλα* (of the shoes of *Hermes*).

Numerals: *δέκα στόματα* (Il. 2. 489), *οὐατα τέσσαρα* (Il. 11. 634), *τέσσαρα δέρματα* (Od. 4. 437), *αἰπόλια ἔνδεκα πάντα* (Od. 14. 103); so with *πάντα* and *πολλά* (Il. 11. 574., 15. 714., 17. 760, Od. 4. 437, 794., 9. 222., 12. 411), and when the context shows that distinct things are meant: as Il. 5. 656 *τῶν μὲν δούρατα* (the spears of *two* warriors), 13. 135 *ἔγχεα . . ἀπὸ χειρῶν*.

A few instances occur in fixed phrases, which may represent an earlier syntax; *λύντο δὲ γυῖα* (but also *λύτο γούνατα*), *ἀμήχανα ἔργα γέροντο*, &c. Note especially the lines ending with *πέλονται* (*τά τε περὰ νηυσὶ πέλονται, ὅτε τ' ἤματα μακρὰ πέλονται, φυκτὰ πέλονται*, &c.).

The exceptions to the use of the Sing. are fewest with Pronouns and Adjectives: doubtless on account of their want of a distinct Plural meaning (see the end of last section).

173.] **The Dual** is chiefly used (1) of two objects thought of as a distinct pair, and (2) when the Numeral *δύω* is used.

1. Thus we have the natural pairs *χεῖρε, πήχες, τένοντε, ὦμοι, μηρῶ, ὄσσε, ὀφθαλμοί*, and (in the Gen. Dat.) *ποδοῦν, βλεφάρουιν*: *σταθμῶ door-posts*; *ἵππῳ the horses of a chariot*, *βόε a yoke of oxen*, *ἄρνε a pair of lambs* (for sacrifice); *δοῦρε* (in Il. 13. 241., 16. 139 of the two spears usually carried, but *δύο δοῦρε* is more common); *ποταμῶ* (Il. 5. 773) of the two rivers of the Troad, and so *κρουνώ* (Il. 22. 147). So of the two warriors in a chariot (Il. 5. 244, 272, 568), two wrestlers (Il. 23. 707), two dancers (Od. 8. 378), the Sirens (Od. 12. 52, &c.); the *Ἀτρεΐδα* and *Αἴαντε*.

The Numeral is generally added in speaking of two wild animals (*θῆρε δύω, λέοντε δύω, &c.*): *κάπρῳ* (Il. 11. 324) and *λέοντε* (Il. 16. 756) are hardly exceptions, since the context shows that two are meant. Also *αἰετῶ* (Od. 2. 146) of two eagles sent as an omen, and *γυπε* (Od. 11. 578) of the vultures that devoured *Tityos*.

The Dual in Il. 8. 185–191 (where Hector calls to *four* horses by name) might be defended, because two is the regular number; but probably v. 185 is spurious. In Il. 23. 413, again,—*αἶ κ' ἀποκηδήσαντε φερώμεθα χεῖρον ἄεθλον*—the Dual is used because

it is the horses that are chiefly in the driver's mind, although he associates himself with them. In Il. 9. 182-195 the Dual refers to the two envoys, Phoenix being overlooked.

Again, when two agents have been mentioned together, or are represented as acting together in any way, the Dual may be used: as Il. 1. 531 τῷ γ' ὡς βουλευόμεντε (of Thetis and Achilles), 16. 823 (of a lion and boar fighting), Od. 3. 128., 13. 372, &c. Similarly, of the meeting of two rivers, Il. 4. 453 ἐς μισγάγκειαν συμβάλλετον ὄβριμον ὕδωρ (cp. 5. 774).

The Dual Pronouns νῶϊ and σφῶϊ are used with comparative regularity: see Il. 1. 257, 336, 574., 5. 34, 287, 718, &c. This usage may be a matter of traditional courtesy. Hence perhaps the scrupulous use where the First Person Dual is meant; Il. 4. 407 ἀγαγόνθ' ('Diomedes and I'); 8. 109 θεράποντε *our attendants*; 11. 313 τί παθόντε λελάσμεθα κτλ.; 12. 323 ὦ πέπον εἰ . . φυγόντε; Od. 3. 128 ἔνα θυμὸν ἔχοντε ('Ulysses and I'). In Od. 2. 78 for ἀπαιτίζοντες ἕως should be read ἀπαιτίζονθ' ἧος, since Telemachus there is speaking of his mother and himself. So with the Second Person, Il. 1. 216 (Athene and Here), 322 (the heralds), 3. 279., 7. 279.

In Il. 3. 278 καὶ οἱ ἐπένερθε καμόντας ἀνθρώπους τίκυσθον, ὅτις κ' ἐπιορκον ὁμόσῃ the two gods indicated by the Dual are doubtless Hades and Persephone, as appears from Il. 9. 456 θεοὶ δ' ἐτέλειον ἐπαράς, Ζεὺς τε καταχθόνιος καὶ ἑπαινή Περσεφόνηα, and 9. 569, where Althaea beats upon the earth κικλήσκουσ' Αἴδην καὶ ἑπαινήν Περσεφόνηαν. And since these were the gods especially called upon as witnesses and avengers of wrong, it is probable that they are meant in Od. 1. 273 θεοὶ δ' ἐπιμάρτυροι ἔσταν. The omission of the names may be a mark of reverence. If this view is correct, it removes the difficulty as to ἔσταν (Meyer, *G. G.* § 577, 1).

2. Of the use with the Numeral the most significant examples are Od. 8. 35, 48 κούρω δὲ κρινθέντε δύω καὶ πενήκοντα βήτην: where the Dual is used by a kind of attraction to the word δύω.

The Dual is never obligatory in Homer, since the Plural may always be used instead of it. Hence we often have a Dual Noun or Pronoun with a Plural Verb or Adjective, and *vice versa*.

The Neut. Dual (like the Neut. Plur.) may go with a Sing. Verb: thus we have ὅσσε with all three Numbers.

Certain of the ancient grammarians—Zenodotus among them—supposed that Homer sometimes used the Dual for the Plural. But Aristarchus showed that in all the passages on which this belief was founded the Dual either had its proper force, or was a false reading.

The use of the Dual in Attic is nearly the same as in Homer: in other dialects it appears to have become obsolete. This was one of the reasons that led some grammarians to maintain that Homer was an Athenian.

CHAPTER IX.

THE PREPOSITIONS.

Introductory.

174.] **Prepositions** are words expressing some local relation, and capable of being used as prefixes in forming Compound Verbs. The Prepositions are also used in construction with oblique Cases of Nouns and Pronouns.

The Adverbs that are construed with oblique Cases, but do not enter into composition with Verbs, are called *Improper Prepositions*.

The list of Homeric Prepositions is the same (with perhaps one exception, see § 226) as that of later classical Greek. In the use of Prepositions, however, there are some marked differences between the two periods (§ 229).

There are no 'Inseparable' Prepositions in Greek: see however § 221.

175.] **Adverbial use.** In post-Homeric Greek it is a rule (subject to a few exceptions only) that a Preposition must either (1) enter into Composition with a Verb or (2) be followed immediately by and 'govern' a Noun or Pronoun in an oblique Case. But in the Homeric language the limitation of the Prepositions to these two uses is still far from being established. A Preposition may not only be separated from the Case-form which it governs (a licence sometimes found in later writers), but may stand as a distinct word without governing any Case. In other words, it may be placed in the sentence with the freedom of an Adverb: *e.g.* ἀμφί may mean either *on both sides* (of an object expressed by an oblique Case) or simply *on both sides*; ἐν may mean *in* (taking a Dat.), or simply *inside*; and so of the others, *e.g.*—

γέλασσε δὲ πᾶσα περὶ χθών *all the earth smiled round about.*

ὑπαὶ δέ τε κόμπος ὀδόντων γίγνεται *beneath arose rattling of teeth.*

These uses, in which the Preposition is treated as an ordinary 'Adverb of place,' may be called in general the *adverbial uses*.

176.] **Tmesis.** The term TMESIS is sometimes applied generally to denote that a Preposition is 'separated' from the Verb

which it qualifies, thus including all 'adverbial' uses, but is more properly restricted to a particular group of these uses, viz. those in which the meaning is the same as the Preposition and Verb have in Composition: *e.g.*—

οὐ κατὰ βοῦς Ὑπερίονος Ἡελίοιο ἥσθιον *who ate up* (κατήσθιον)
the oxen of the sun.

οὓς ποτ' ἀπ' Αἰνείαν ἐλόμην *which I took from* (ἀφειλόμην) *Aeneas.*

ὑπὸ δ' ἔσχετο μισθόν *and promised* (ὑπέσχετο) *hire.*

μετὰ νῶτα βαλὼν *turning his back.*

χείρας ἀπὸ ξίφει τμήσας *cutting off his hands by a sword.*

This is the sense in which the word *τμήσις* was employed by the Greek grammarians, who looked at the peculiarities of Homer as deviations from the later established usage, and accordingly regarded the independent place of the Preposition as the result of a 'severance' of the Compound Verb. We may retain the term, provided that we understand it to mean no more than the fact that the two elements which formed a single word in later Greek were still separable in the language of Homer.

The distinction between *Tmesis* (in the strict sense) and other 'adverbial' uses cannot be drawn with any certainty. The clearest cases are those in which the compound Verb is necessary for the construction of other words in the sentence; *e.g.* in ἀπ' Αἰνείαν ἐλόμην or ὑπὸ δ' ἔσχετο μισθόν. On the other hand, the use is simply adverbial in—

περὶ φρένας ἱμερος αἰρεῖ *desire seizes his heart all round* (because the Compound περιαιρέω means *to strip off, to take away from round a thing*).

ὡς τοὺς ἡγεμόνες διεκόσμεον . . μετὰ δὲ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων *and in the midst the king Agamemnon.*

ὡς Τρῶες πρὸ μὲν ἄλλοι ἀρηρότες, αὐτὰρ ἐπ' ἄλλοι *the Trojans, arrayed some in front, others behind.*

177.] Ellipse of the Verb. In certain cases, viz. when the Verb is understood, a Preposition may represent the whole Predicate of a clause:—

οἰωνοὶ δὲ περὶ πλέες ἢ γυναικες *about (him) are more &c.*

ἐνθ' ἐνι μὲν φιλότης *therein is love.*

οὐ τοι ἐπι δέος *there is no fear for thee.*

ἀλλ' ἀνα *but up!*

πάρα δ' ἀνὴρ *the man is at hand.*

πάρ' ἔμοιγε καὶ ἄλλοι *others are at my command* (not *are beside me*, but = *πάρεισι* in its derived sense).

So when a Verb is to be repeated from a preceding clause; as *Il.* 24. 229–233 *ἔνθεν δώδεκα μὲν περικαλλέας ἔξελε πέπλους . . ἐκ δὲ δ' αἰθώνας τρίποδας*: *Il.* 3. 267 *ῥρυντο δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων, ἂν δ' Ὀδυσσεύς* (*sc. ῥρυντο*).

178.] **Use with oblique Cases.** Prepositions are frequently used in Greek with the Accusative, the locative and instrumental Dative, and the ablative Genitive; much less commonly (if at all) with the true Genitive.

It may be shown (chiefly by comparison with Sanscrit) that the government of Cases by Prepositions belongs to a later stage of the language than the use of Prepositions with Verbs. In the first instance the Case was construed directly with the Verb, and the Preposition did no more than qualify the Verbal meaning. *E.g.* in such a sentence as *εἰς Τροίην ἦλθε* the Acc. *Τροίην* originally went with *ἦλθε*. If however the construction *Τροίην ἦλθε* ceased to be usual except with *εἰς*, the Preposition would be felt to be necessary for the Acc., *i. e.* would 'govern' it.

In Homer we find many instances of a transitional character, in which a Case-form which appears to be governed by a Preposition may equally well be construed directly with the Verb,—modified, it may be, in meaning by the Preposition.

Thus we have *ἀμφί* with the Dat. in the recurring form—

ἀμφί δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος,

but the Preposition is not necessary for the Case, as we see from its absence in *τόξ' ὤμοισιν ἔχων*, &c., and again from forms such as—

*ἀμφί δὲ χαίται | ὤμοις αἰσσοῦνται,
περί μὲν ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον | ὤμοιῖν βαλόμεν*

where the Preposition is best taken in the adverbial use. Cp. Il. 17. 523 *ἐν δὲ οἱ ἐγχος | νηδυίοισι μάλ' ὀξὺ κραιομένομενον λυέ γυῖα*, where *ἐν* is adverbial.

Again, we seem to have *ἀμφί* governing the Accusative in—

Il. 11. 482 *ὣς ῥα τότ' ἀμφ' Ὀδυσῆα . . Τρῶες ἔπον.*

But *ἀμφί* must be taken with *ἔπον*, as in Il. 11. 776 *σφῶϊ μὲν ἀμφὶ βοῶς ἔπετον κρέα*. So in *ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἤγαγε* brought under the yoke the supposition of Tmesis is borne out by the form *ἤπαγε ζυγὸν ὠκέας ἵππους*. And in the line—

Il. 1. 53 *ἐννῆμαρ μὲν ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὦχετο κῆλα θεοῖο*

the rhythm is against taking *ἀνὰ στρατὸν* together (§ 367, 1), and points therefore to *ἀνῶχετο*.

Again, the ablative Genitive in—

ἦλθ' ἐξ ἁλός came out from the sea

may be explained like *τείχεος ἐξελθεῖν*, &c.; and in *νηὸς ἀπὸ πρύμνης χαμάδις πέσε* like *νηὸς ἀποθρόσκων*, and numerous similar constructions.

Thus the history of the usage of Prepositions confirms the general principle laid down in a previous chapter (§ 131), that the oblique Cases, with the exception of the true Genitive, are

primarily construed with Verbs, and that consequently the construction of these Cases with Nouns and (we may now add) Prepositions is always of a derivative kind.

179.] **Use with the Genitive.** Where the Genitive with a Preposition is not ablative, it may usually be explained in two ways, between which it is not always easy to choose:—

(1) It may be derived from one of the uses with Verbs discussed in §§ 149–151. *E.g.* the Genitive in—

ὅς τ' εἰσιν διὰ δούρος *which goes through the wood*

is probably the Genitive of the space *within which* motion takes place. For εἰσιν διὰ δούρος has the same relation to πεδίοιο διώκειν and πεδίοιο διαπρήσσειν, that ἦλθεν εἰς Τροίην has to Τροίην ἦλθεν and Τροίην εἰσῆλθεν.

(2) It may be of the same kind as the Genitive with a Noun: *e.g.* the construction with ἀντί may be the same as with the Adverbs ἅντα, ἀντίον, ἀντία, &c., and the Adjectives ἀντίος, ἐναντίος, &c., and this is evidently not akin to any of the constructions with Verbs, but falls under the general rule that a Noun or Pronoun qualifying a Noun is put in the Genitive (§ 147).

It is held by Curtius (*Elucidations*, c. 17) that the Genitive with ἀντί, πρό, διά, ὑπέρ, ὑπό, when they do not necessarily imply *motion from*, is of the same kind as the ordinary Genitive with Adjectives and Adverbs, *i.e.* the true Genitive. This view is supported by the Improper Prepositions, which nearly all govern the Genitive, whatever their meaning: *e.g.* ἐγγύς and ἐκάς, ἐντός and ἔκτός, ἅντα, μέχρι, ἔνεκα, &c. For in these cases the construction evidently does not depend upon the local relation involved, but is of the same kind as in δέμας πυρός, χάρις Τρώων, &c.

On the other hand, it is pointed out by Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 134) that such a construction of the Genitive is unknown in Sanscrit, and this argument, which applies to πρό, ὑπό, ὑπέρ (Sanscr. *prá, úpa, upári*), is confirmed by the Latin construction of *pro, sub, super* with the Abl. He would allow the supposition however in the case of ἀντί (the Sanscrit *ánti* being an Adverb), and perhaps διά; regarding these words as having become Prepositions more recently than the others.

180.] **Accentuation.** The rules for the accentuation of Compound Verbs have been already given in § 88. They proceed on the general principle that (except in the augmented forms) the accent falls if possible on the Preposition; either on the last syllable (as ἀπό-δος), or, if that is elided, then on the first (as ὑπ-αγε).

In regard to the other uses, and in particular the use with

Cases, the general assumption made by the Greek grammarians is that all Prepositions are oxytone. They do not recognise the modern distinction according to which *ἐν*, *εἰς*, and *ἐξ* are unaccented. This distinction rests entirely on the practice of the manuscripts (Chandler, p. 254), and apparently arises from the accident of the smooth breathing and accent falling on the same letter (Wackernagel, *K. Z.* xxix. 137).

Disyllabic Prepositions, however, are liable in certain cases to become barytone. The exact determination of these cases was a matter of much difficulty with the ancients, and unfortunately we cannot now determine how far their *dicta* rest upon observation of usage, and how far upon analogy and other theoretical considerations. The chief points of the accepted doctrine are:—

(1) The disyllabic Prepositions, except *ἀμφί*, *ἀντί*, *ἀνά*, and *διά* (except also the dialectical forms *κατά*, *ὑπαί*, *παραί*, *ἀπαί*, *ὑπείρ*, *προτί*), are liable to ‘Anastrophe;’ that is to say, when placed *immediately after* the Verb or the Case-form to which they belong, they throw back the accent; as *λούσῃ ἄπο* (= *ἀπολούσῃ*), *ἔχεν κατά*, *ᾧ ἔπι*, *μάχῃ ἐν*, *Ζεφύρου ὕπο*, &c. Some held that the insertion of *δέ* before the Preposition did not prevent Anastrophe, and accordingly wrote *ᾧσε δ’ ἄπο*, &c.

(2) Also, according to some, if the Prep. stands at the end of a verse, or before a full stop (Schol. A on *Il.* 5. 283).

(3) Also, when it is equivalent to a Compound Verb (§ 177); as *ἐν*, *ἐπι*, *πéρι*, *πάρα* (for *ἐν-εστι*, &c.). So *ἄνα* (for *ἀνάστηθι*); although *ἀνά* according to most authorities was not liable to Anastrophe. Some wrote *πάρα γάρ θεοί εἰσι καὶ ἡμῖν* (*Il.* 3. 440), on the ground that in *πάρ-εισι* the accent is on the syllable *παρ-*.

(4) Two Prepositions are barytone in the adverbial use,—

ἄπο when it is = *ἀποθεν at a distance*, and

πéρι when it is = *περισσῶς exceedingly*.

To which some added *ὑπο* (as *τρομέει δ’ ὑπο γῆα*, &c.).

(5) Monosyllabic Prepositions when placed after the governed word take the acute accent (as an equivalent for Anastrophe); but only when they come at the end of the line. Some however accented *Od.* 3. 137—

καλεσσαμένω ἀγορήν ἔς πάντας Ἀχαιοῦς.

Most Prepositions, as appears from the Sanscrit accent, are originally barytone, and the so-called Anastrophe is really the *retention* of the accent in certain cases in which the Preposition is emphatic, or has a comparatively independent place in the sentence. Just as there is an orthotone *ἔστι* and an enclitic *ἐστι* (§ 87, 1), so there is an orthotone *πéρι* and a ‘proclitic’ *περι*, written *περί* before a governed Noun, but in reality unaccented.

This view will serve to explain one or two minor peculiarities of Greek usage. Thus (1) it is the rule that when the last syllable of a Preposition is elided before a Case-form, the accent is not thrown back. This is intelligible on the ground that the Preposition is in fact without accent; and the same account will apply to the same peculiarity in the case of ἀλλά and τινά. On the other hand, (2) in the case of elision before a Verb (as ἔπαγε) the accent is retracted, because the Preposition is then the accented word.* Again, (3) the general rule of the Æolic dialect, that all oxytones become barytone, does not extend to Prepositions, because they are not real oxytones.

The word ἐνί (Sanscr. *áti*) is a Preposition which happens to have survived (with the original accent) in the adverbial use only: cp. πρὸς = *besides*.

One or two suggestions may be added in reference to the Prepositions which are generally said to be incapable of Anastrophe:—

ἀνά was thought by some to be capable of Anastrophe, and this view is supported by the adverbial use ἀνα ὑπ'!

ἀμφί is probably a real oxytone, like the Adverb ἀμφίς. The corresponding Sanscrit Preposition *abhi* is oxytone, contrary to the general rule.

The assertion that ὑπαί, παρὰ, προτί, &c. are not liable to Anastrophe is difficult of interpretation. It may mean only that these words are not Attic, and by consequence that later usage furnished the grammarians with no examples.

If this is the true account of Anastrophe, it is probable that the Prepositions retained their accent in all quasi-adverbial uses, including Tmesis—not only when they followed the Verb or governed Noun. The doctrine of the grammarians is unintelligible unless it admits of this extension. For if we write πᾶρ' ἐμοί γε καὶ ἄλλοι because πᾶρα = πᾶρεισι, we must also write πᾶρα γὰρ θεοί εἰσι, where πᾶρα is equally emphatic. In Sanscrit too the Preposition when separated from its Verb is accented.

It is not so clear how far the later rules for Prepositions in Composition are to be applied to Homer. In Sanscrit there is an important difference between Principal and Subordinate Clauses. In a Principal Clause the Verb loses its accent, unless it begins the sentence (§ 87); the Preposition (which usually precedes the Verb, but is not always immediately before it) is accented. Thus we should have, on Sanscrit rules, such forms

* See Wackernagel, *K. Z.* xxiii. 457 ff. On this view, however, the original accent would be ἀπο-δος, ἐνι-σπες, πᾶρα-σches, &c. It may perhaps be preserved in the Indic. ἐνι-σπες and Imper. ἐνι-σπε (see § 88, where a different explanation of these forms was suggested).

as *πέρῃ δειδία*, *πέρῃ πάντων οἶδε*, &c. But in Subordinate Clauses the accent is on the Verb, and the Preposition commonly forms one word with it, as in *περιδείδῃα*. If the Preposition is separated from the Verb, both are accented. In classical Greek two changes have taken place: (1) the Preposition and Verb are inseparable, and (2) the accent is placed almost uniformly according to the 'law of three syllables' (§ 88):—if it falls on the Preposition, as in *σύμ-φῃμι*, *κάτ-εχεν*, or on the Verb, as in *συμ-φῆσει*, *κατ-έχει*, the reason is purely rhythmical. The first of these changes had not taken place in the time of Homer. As to the second we are practically without evidence. We do not even know when the law of three syllables obtained in Greek. It may be observed however that—

(1) When a word of three syllables could not be unaccented, the form *πέρῃ δειδία* became impossible; but it does not follow that *πέρῃ* lost its accent at the same time. An intermediate *πέρῃ δείδῃα* is quite admissible as a hypothesis.

(2) In many places in Homer it is uncertain whether a Preposition is part of a Compound or retains its character as a separate word. Thus we find—

Il. 4. 538 πολλοὶ δὲ περὶ κτείνοντο καὶ ἄλλοι (Wolf, from Ven. A.).

16. 497 ἐμεῦ περὶ μάργα χαλκῷ (πέρῃ sic Ven. A.).

18. 191 στεῦτο γὰρ Ἡφαιστοιο παρ' οἰσέμεν ἔντεα καλά (so Ar.).

1. 269 καὶ μὲν τοῖσιν ἐγὼ μέθ' ὀμίλεον (Ar.).

with the variants *περικτείνοντο*, *περιμάργα*, *παροισέμεν*, *μεθομίλεον*. And the existing texts contain a good many Compounds which we might write *divisim* without loss to the sense; as Il. 18. 7 νησὶν ἐπικλονέονται, Od. 8. 14 πόντον ἐπιπλαγχθεῖς, Od. 16. 466 ἄστυ καταβλώσκοντα, Il. 2. 150, 384., 3. 12., 4. 230., 5. 332, 763, 772., 6. 100, &c.

In reference to such forms we may fairly argue that the tendency of grammarians and copyists, unfamiliar with the free adverbial use of the Prepositions, would be always towards forming Compounds; hence that modern critics ought to lean rather to the side of writing the words separately, and giving the Prepositions the accent which belonged to them as Adverbs.

With regard to the accent of Prepositions in the ordinary use with Case-forms it is still more difficult to decide. A Sanscrit Preposition generally follows the Noun which it governs: hence it does not furnish us with grounds for any conclusion about the Greek accent.

180*.] **Apocope.** Most Prepositions appear in Homer under several different forms, due to loss of the final vowel combined (in most cases) with assimilation to a following consonant.

Thus we find—

παρά and πάρ :

ἀνά, ἄν, ἄμ (βωμοῖσι, φόνον) :

κατά, καδ (δέ), κάβ-(βαλε), κάτ-(θανε), κάρ (ρόον), καμ-(μονίη),
καγ (γόνυ), κάκ (κεφαλῆς), κάλ-(λιπε), κάπ (πεδίον) :

ὑπό, ὑβ-(βάλλειν) :

πρὸτί, πρὸς (for προτ-), cp. ποτί, πός :

ὑπείρ (for ὑπέρι), ὑπέρ :

ἐνί, εἰν (εἰνί), ἐν :

ἀπό, ἀπ-(πέμψει).

This phenomenon appears to be connected with the loss of accent which the Preposition suffers when closely connected with a Verb or Case-form. That is to say, from the adverbial forms πάρα, πρὸτί, κάτω, ἐνί, ἄνα (or ἀνά), &c. were formed in the first instance the unaccented παρ, προς, κατ or κα, ἐν, ἄν. Then the pairs πάρα and παρ, &c. were used promiscuously. Finally one form was adopted as normal.

ἀμφί.

181.] The Preposition ἀμφί means *on both sides*, or (if the notion of two sides is not prominent) *all round*. It is doubtless connected with ἄμφω *both*.

The adverbial use is common ; e.g. with a Verb understood, Od. 6. 292 ἐν δὲ κρήνῃ νάει, ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμών *and around is a meadow*.

It is especially used in reference to the two sides of the body : Il. 5. 310 ἀμφὶ δὲ ὅσσε κελαυνὴ νύξ ἐκάλυψε *black night covered his eyes on both sides* (i.e. both eyes) ; Il. 10. 535 ἀμφὶ κτύπος οὐατα βάλλει : Il. 18. 414 σπώγγῳ δ' ἀμφὶ πρόσωπα καὶ ἄμφω χεῖρ' ἀπομόργνυ : Od. 2. 153 παρείας ἀμφί τε δειράς : Od. 9. 389 πάντα δέ οἱ βλέφαρ' ἀμφὶ καὶ ὀφρύας κτλ.

So Il. 6. 117 ἀμφὶ δέ μιν σφυρὰ τύπτε καὶ ἀνχένα δέρμα κελαιόν *the shield smote him on the ankles on both sides and on the neck*. Here ἀμφί is generally taken to mean *above and beneath* ; wrongly, as the passages quoted above show.

This use of ἀμφί is extended to the *internal* organs, esp. the midriff (φρένες) regarded as the seat of feeling : as—

Il. 3. 442 οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μ' ὦδε ἔρως φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψε.

6. 355 ἐπεὶ σὲ μάλιστα πόνος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκε.

16. 481 ἐνθ' ἄρα τε φρένες ἔρχαται ἀμφ' ἀδινὸν κῆρ.

Od. 8. 541 μάλα πού μιν ἄχος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκεν.

So Hesiod, Theog. 554 χῶσατο δὲ φρένας ἀμφί : Hom. H. Apoll.

273, H. Ven. 243 ; Mimnerm. i. 7 φρένας ἀμφὶ κακαὶ τείρουσι μέριμναι. Hence read—

Il. i. 103 μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφὶ μέλαιναι πύμπλαντ',
and similarly in Il. 17. 83, 499, 573.

182.] The Dative with ἀμφὶ is a natural extension of the ordinary locatival Dative—the Preposition being adverbial, and not always needed to govern the Case. Compare (*e.g.*)—

Il. i. 45 τόξ' ὤμοισιν ἔχων (Loc. Dat., § 145, 3).

20. 150 ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ἄρρηκτον νεφέλην ὤμοισιν ἔσαντο.

11. 527 ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν ἔχει σάκος *has a shield on both sides on his shoulders, i.e. across his shoulders.*

In a metaphorical sense ἀμφὶ is applied to the object *about* which two parties contend : as Il. 3. 70 ἀμφ' Ἑλένη καὶ κτήμασι πᾶσι μάχεσθαι : so of a negotiation, Il. 13. 382 συνώμεθα ἀμφὶ γάμφω *we shall agree about the marriage* ; Il. 7. 408 ἀμφὶ δὲ νεκροῖσιν *as to the question of the dead* ; Il. 16. 647 ἀμφὶ φόνῳ Πατρόκλου μερμηρίζω. Cp. the use with περί (§ 186). So too in Sanscrit the Loc. is used with Verbs of *fighting* to express the object *over* which the fighting is.

It is a further extension of this use when ἀμφὶ with the Dat. is construed with Verbs meaning *to speak, think, &c.*, as Od. 4. 151 ἀμφ' Ὀδυσσῇ μυθεόμην. This last variety (in which the notion of *two sides* disappears) is confined to the Odyssey : cp. 5. 287., 14. 338, 364.

A true Dative may follow ἀμφὶ, but cannot be said to be governed by it ; *e.g.* in Il. 14. 420 ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ βράχε τεύχεα *his arms rattled about him* the Dat. is 'ethical,' as in Il. 13. 439 ῥῆξεν δέ οἱ ἀμφὶ χιτῶνα. So in Il. 4. 431 ἀμφὶ δὲ πᾶσι τεύχεα ποικίλ' ἔλαμπε, the Dat. is not locatival, but the true Dat. The two kinds of Dat. may be combined, as Il. 18. 205 ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ κεφαλῇ νέφος ἔστεφε.

The construction of ἀμφὶ with the Dat. is not found in Attic prose. It survives in the poetical style, and in Herodotus.

183.] The Accusative with ἀμφὶ is used when the Verb expresses *motion*, as—

Il. 5. 314 ἀμφὶ δ' ἔδον φίλον υἷδν ἐχέυατο πηχέε λευκώ.

Also to express *extent*, diffusion over a space, &c. (ideas naturally conveyed by terms denoting motion):—

Od. 11. 419 ὥς ἀμφὶ κρητῆρα τραπέζας τε πληθούσας κείμεθα
as we lay (scattered) about &c.

Accordingly it is especially used in Homer—

(1) of dwellers *about* a place, as Il. 2. 499, 751, &c.

- (2) of attendants or followers; as Il. 2. 445 οἱ δ' ἄμφ' Ἀτρεΐωνα . . θύνον *they bustled about Agamemnon*.

The description *about (a person)* does not exclude the person who is the centre of the group; e.g. in Il. 4. 294 (Agamemnon found Nestor) οὗς ἐτάρους στέλλοντα . . ἄμφι μέγαν Πελάγοντα Ἀλάστορά τε Χρομίον τε, where Pelagon &c. are included under the word ἐταροί. This is an approach to the later idiom, οἱ ἄμφι Πλάτωνα = *Plato and his school*.

It should be observed that the motion expressed by the Verb when ἄμφι takes an Acc. is not motion *to a point*, but motion *over a space*. Hence this Acc. is not to be classed with Accusatives of the *terminus ad quem*, but with the Accusatives of Space (§ 138). This remark will be confirmed by similar uses of other Prepositions.

184.] The Genitive with ἄμφι is found in two instances,—

Il. 16. 825 μάχεσθον πίδακος ἄμφ' ὀλίγης *fight over a small spring of water*.

Od. 8. 267 αἰεῖδων ἄμφ' Ἄρεος φιλότῆτος κτλ.

Another example may perhaps lurk in—

Il. 2. 384 εἴ δέ τις ἄρματος ἄμφις ἰδὼν κτλ.

if we read ἄμφι Φιδῶν (*having looked over, seen to his chariot*). With this meaning compare Il. 18. 254 ἄμφι μάλα φράζεσθε: and for the construction the Attic use of περιωρῶμαι with a Gen. = *to look round after, take thought about* (Thuc. 4. 124): also the Gen. with ἀμφιμάχεσθαι Il. 16. 496., 18. 20., 15. 391.

περί.

185.] The Preposition περί (or πέρι, § 180) has in Homer the two meanings *around* and *beyond*.

Both these meanings are common in the adverbial use; the second often yields the derivative meaning *beyond measure, exceedingly*, as—

Il. 16. 186 πέρι μὲν θείειν ταχύν *exceeding swift to run*.

18. 549 πέρι θαῦμα τέτυκτο *was an exceeding wonder*.

Od. 4. 722 πέρι γάρ μοι Ὀλύμπιος ἄλγε' ἔδωκε *for Zeus has given to me griefs beyond measure*.

The meaning *beyond* is found in Tmesis, Il. 12. 322 πόλεμον περὶ τόνδε φυγόντες *escaping this war*: Il. 19. 230 πολέμοιο περὶ στυγεροῖο λίπωνται *shall remain over from war*: and in Composition, περίεμι *I excel*, περιγίγνομαι *I get beyond, surpass*, περίοδα *I know exceedingly well* (Il. 13. 728 βουλῇ περιδμεναι ἄλλων *to be knowing in counsel beyond others*; cp. Od. 3. 244., 17. 317). The Gen. in such constructions is ablative (§ 152).

186.] The Dative with *περί* (as with *ἀμφί*) is Locative; as Il. 1. 303 ἐρωήσει περί δουρί *will gush over* (lit. *round upon*) the spear; 2. 389 περί δ' ἔγχει χεῖρα καμείται *his hand will be weary with holding the spear*; 2. 416 χιτῶνα περί στήθεσσι δαΐξαι *to tear the chiton about (round on) the breast*. Also of an object of contention, *over*; as Il. 16. 568 περί παιδί . . πόνος εἶη *the toil (of battle) might be over his son*, cp. Il. 17. 4, 133, Od. 5. 310: and in a derivative sense, Od. 2. 245 μαχήσασθαι περί δαυτί *to fight about a feast*.

1. It is a question which meaning is to be given to *περί* in—

Il. 5. 566 περί γὰρ δῖε ποιμένι λαῶν (so 9. 433., 11. 555).

10. 240 ἔδεισεν δὲ περί ξανθῷ Μενελάῳ.

17. 242 ὅσσον ἐμῇ κεφαλῇ πέρι δείδια (or *περιδείδια*).

and in the Compound (Il. 11. 508 τῷ βα περίδεισαν, 15. 123 περιδείσασα θεοῖσι, 21. 328., 23. 822). Most commentators here take *περί* = *exceedingly* and the Dat. of the person as a *Dativus ethicus*: *περί γὰρ δῖε ποιμένι* for *he feared exceedingly for the shepherd*, &c. But it is difficult to find Homeric analogies for such a use of the Dative, and the meaning *over, on behalf of* is supported by later writers: H. Merc. 236 χωόμενον περί βουσί, H. Cer. 77 ἀχθυμένην περί παιδί, Hdt. 3. 35 περί ἑωντῷ δειμαίνοντα, Thuc. 1. 60 δεδιότες περί κτλ.; also by the use of *ἀμφί* with the Dat. (§ 182) in nearly the same meaning.

2. Much difficulty has been felt about the use of *περί* in a group of phrases of which the following are the chief instances:—

Il. 4. 53 τὰς διαπέρσαι, ὅτ' ἂν τοι ἀπέχθωνται περί κῆρι (cp. 4. 45, &c.).

Od. 6. 158 κείνος δ' αὖ περί κῆρι μακάρτατος ἔσοχον ἄλλων.

Il. 21. 65 περί δ' ἤθελε θυμῷ (so 24. 236).

22. 70 ἀλύσσοντες περί θυμῷ.

Od. 14. 146 περί γὰρ μ' ἐφίλει καὶ κήδετο θυμῷ.

Il. 16. 157 τοῖσιν τε περί φρεσὶν ἄσπετος ἀλκή.

Od. 14. 433 περί γὰρ φρεσὶν αἶσιμα ἦδη.

In all these places the Dative may be construed as a Locative (although *κῆρι* without *περί* is only found in Il. 9. 117): the only question is whether the Preposition is to be taken in the literal local sense *round, all over*, or in the derivative sense *exceedingly*. In favour of the latter it may be said that the same combinations of Preposition and Verb are found without a Dat. such as *κῆρι* or *θυμῷ*, where accordingly *περί* must mean *exceedingly*; compare—

Il. 13. 430 τὴν περί κῆρι φίλησε πατὴρ }

Od. 8. 63 τὸν περί Μοῦσ' ἐφίλησε }

Od. 14. 433 περί γὰρ φρεσὶν αἶσιμα ἦδη }

2. 88 περί κέρδεα οἶδε }

Il. 16. 157 τοῖσιν τε περί φρεσὶν ἄσπετος ἀλκή }

Od. 12. 279 πέρι τοι μένος }

Od. 5. 36 περί κῆρι θεὸν ὧς τιμήσουσι }

Il. 8. 161 περί μὲν σε τίον Δαναοί. }

Again, in Il. 4. 46 τάνω μοι περί κῆρι τίεσκετο the meaning *beyond* is required by the Gen. *τάνω*; cp. 4. 257 περί μὲν σε τίω Δαναῶν ταχυπόλων, 7. 289 περί δ' ἔγχει Ἀχαιῶν φέρτατος ἔσσι, 17. 22 περί σθένει βλεμαίνει. So with the Acc. in Il. 13. 631 περί φρένας ἔμμεναι ἄλλων.

On the other side, the representation of a feeling as something *surrounding* or *covering* the heart, midriff, &c. is common in Homer. Thus we have—

Il. 11. 89 σίτου τε γλυκεροῖο περὶ φρένας ἱμερος αἰρεῖ.

Od. 9. 362 ἐπεὶ Κύκλωπα περὶ φρένας ἤλυθεν ὄϊνος.

So of a sound, Il. 10. 139 περὶ φρένας ἤλυθ' ἰωή (cp. Od. 17. 261). And more frequently with ἀμφί; cp. Od. 19. 516 πυκινὰ δέ μοι ἀμφ' ἀδινὸν κῆρ ὀξείαι μελεδῶνες ὀδυρομένην ἐρέθουσι; and the other passages quoted at the end of § 181. Similarly περὶ κῆρι, περὶ φρεσί, may have been meant in the literal sense,—the feeling (fear, anger, &c.) being thought of as *filling* or *covering* the heart. On the whole, however, the evidence is against this view;—unless indeed we explain περὶ κῆρι as a traditional phrase, used without a distinct sense of its original meaning.

The occasional use of the Dat. with περὶ in Attic is probably due to familiarity with Homer.

187.] **The Accusative with περὶ** is used (as with ἀμφί) when *motion* or *extent in space* is expressed: as Il. 1. 448 ἐκατόμβην ἕστησαν περὶ βωμόν *placed the hecatomb round the altar*; 2. 750 περὶ Δωδώνην οἴκ' ἔθεντο *made their dwellings round Dodona*. Generally speaking the Accusative implies surrounding in a less exact or complete way than the Dative. It makes us think of the *space about* an object rather than of its actual circumference. Occasionally, of course, the circumference is the space over which motion takes place, or extent is measured: as Il. 12. 297 ῥάψε ῥάβδοισι διηνεκέσιν περὶ κύκλον *round in a circle*; Il. 18. 274 ἐστάμεναι περὶ τοῖχον *to stand along the wall all round it*.

188.] **The Genitive with περὶ** is used in three distinct ways:—

1. With περὶ meaning *beyond* (in the figurative sense, = *excelling*) it expresses the object of comparison: Il. 1. 287 περὶ πάντων ἔμμεναι *to surpass all*, Od. 1. 235 αἴστον ἐποίησαν περὶ πάντων *have made him unseen more than all men*, 4. 231 ἐπιστάμενος περὶ πάντων. This use is distinctively Homeric. The Gen. is ablative, as with Adjectives of comparison (§ 152).

2. With περὶ = *round, over* (in the local sense) the Gen. is very rare; the instances are—

Od. 5. 68 ἦδ' αὐτοῦ τετάνυστο περὶ σπείους γλαφυροῖο ἡμερὶς ἠβώωσα.

130 τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν ἐσάωσα περὶ τρόπιος βεβαῶτα.

The Gen. may be akin to the (partitive) Gen. of place (§ 149): the vine *e.g.* grew *round in* or *over* (but not *covering*) the cave.

3. With περὶ = *over* (the object of a contest), as Il. 16. 1 ὥς οἱ μὲν περὶ νηὸς ἑσσεύοιο μάχοντο, 12. 142 ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ νηῶν *to defend the ships*; sometimes also in the figurative sense, *about*, Il. 11. 700 περὶ τρίποδος γὰρ ἔμελλον θεύσεσθαι, Od. 9. 423 ὥς τε

περί ψυχῆς *as when life is at stake*; and of *doubt*, Il. 20. 17 ἦ τι περί Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν μερμηρίζεις. The use with Verbs of *anger* and *fear* is closely akin; Il. 9. 449 παλλακίδος πέρι χώσατο; 17. 240 νέκνυς πέρι δειδία (unless we read περιχώσατο, περιδείδια).

The *weapons* of the contest are said to be fought *over* in Od. 8. 225 ἐρίεσκον περί τόξων; so Il. 15. 284 ὅππότε κοῦροι ἐρίσσειαν περί μύθων. And this is also applied to the quarrel itself, Il. 16. 476 συνίτην ἔριδος πέρι θυμοβόροιο (cp. 20. 253).

Under this head will come the Gen. in Il. 23. 485 τρίποδος περιδόμεθον *let us wager a tripod*, Od. 23. 78 ἐμέθεν περιδώσομαι αὐτῆς *I will stake myself*. Whatever may be the original meaning of περιδόσθαι, it is construed as if = *to join issue, contend* (Lat. *pignore certare*): cp. the Attic use περιδίδομαι τινι περί (Gen. of the thing staked).

By a not unnatural extension, περί with the Gen. follows Verbs meaning to *speak, know, &c.*, but only in the Odyssey; viz. 1. 135 (= 3. 77) ἵνα μιν περί πατρὸς ἀποικομένοιο ἔροιτο; 15. 347 εἴπ' ἄγε μοι περί μητρὸς κτλ.; 17. 563 οἶδα γὰρ εὖ περί κείνου; also 1. 405, 7. 191, 16. 234, 17. 371, 19. 270. Note that the corresponding use of ἀμφί with the Dat. is similarly peculiar to the Odyssey (§ 182).

The origin of this group of constructions is not quite clear. It may be noted, however, that they answer for the most part to constructions of the Gen. without a Preposition; cp. ἀμύνεσθαι περί νηῶν and ἀμύνεσθαι νηῶν; and again εἰπέ περί μητρὸς, οἶδα περί κείνου, &c. with the examples given in § 151, d.

παρά.

189.] The Preposition παρά (παρά, by Apocope πάρ) means *alongside*. It is common in the adverbial use (see § 177), and also in Tmesis and Composition. Note the derivative meanings—

- (1) *at hand*, hence *at command*; as Il. 9. 43 πάρ τοι ὁδός *the way is open to you*; Od. 9. 125 οὐ γὰρ Κυκλώπεσσι νέες πάρα.
- (2) *aside*; as Il. 11. 233 παρὰ δέ οἱ ἐτράπετ' ἔγχος *the spear was turned to his side* (instead of striking him).
- (3) hence figuratively, παρά μ' ἥπαφε *cozened me 'aside,' away from my aim*: and so παρπεπιδῶν *changing the mind by persuasion*, παρειπών *talking over, &c.*; also, with a different metaphor, *wrongly*.
- (4) *past*, with Verbs of motion, as ἔρχομαι, ἐλαύνω, &c.

190.] With the Dative παρά means *beside, in the company of, near*. It is applied in Homer to both persons and things (whereas in later Greek the Dat. with παρά is almost wholly

confined to persons); thus we have *παρὰ νηϊ*, *παρὰ νηυσί* (very frequently), *παρ' ἄρμασι*, *παρὰ βωμῷ*, *παρ ποσί*, *παρὰ σταθμῷ*, &c.

This Dat. is either locatival or instrumental: see § 144. It may be used after a Verb of motion (e.g. Il. 13. 617), see § 145, 4.

191.] The Accusative with *παρά* is commonly used—

(1) when *motion* ends *beside* or *near* a person or thing: as Il.

3. 406 ἦσο παρ' αὐτὸν ἰοῦσα *go and sit by him*; Il. 7. 190 τὸν μὲν παρ πόδ' ἔδν χαμάδις βάλε.

Hence the use of the Acc. often *implies* motion: as Il. 11. 314 παρ' ἐμ' ἴστασο *place yourself beside me*; Od. 1. 333 στή ῥα παρὰ σταθμὸν *came and stood beside the pillar*; Il. 6. 433 λαὸν δὲ στήσιν παρ' ἐρινεόν. Similarly of the *place near which* a weapon has struck, as Il. 5. 146 κληῖδα παρ' ὤμων πλῆξε *struck the collar-bone by the shoulder*.

(2) of *motion* or *extent alongside* of a thing (esp. a coast, a river, a wall, &c.); Il. 1. 34 βῆ δ' ἀκέων παρὰ θίνα *went along the shore*; Od. 9. 46 πολλὰ δὲ μῆλα ἔσφαζον παρὰ θίνα *sacrificed many sheep along the shore*; Il. 2. 522 παρ ποταμὸν ἔναιον *dwelt by the side of the river*; Il. 3. 272 παρ ξίφεος κουλεὸν ἄωρτο *hung beside the sword-scabard*.

(3) of *motion past* a place; as Il. 11. 166, 167 οἱ δὲ παρ' Ἰλου σῆμα . . παρ' ἐρινεὸν ἔσσεύοντο *they sped past the tomb of Ilus, past the fig-tree*; Il. 6. 42 παρὰ τρόχον ἔξεκυλίσθη *rolled out past the wheel*; Il. 16. 312 οὗτα Θόαντα στέρνον γυνωθέντα παρ' ἀσπίδα *passing the shield* (implied motion, οὗτα = *thrust at and struck*). The derivative meaning *beyond* (= *in excess of*) is only found in Homer in the phrases παρ δύναμιν (Il. 13. 787) and παρὰ μοῖραν (Od. 14. 509): but cp. the Adj. *παράσιος* *against fate*.

192.] With a Genitive *παρά* properly means *sideways from, aside from*. As with the Dative, it is used of *things* as well as *persons* (whereas in later Greek it is practically restricted to *persons*). On the other hand it is confined in Homer to the local sense; thus it is found with Verbs meaning *to go, bring, take, &c.* not (as afterwards) with *ἀκούω, μανθάνω, οἶδα*, or the like. An apparent exception is—

Il. 11. 794 εἰ δέ τινα φρεσὶν ᾗσι θεοπροπλήν ἀλεείνει,
καὶ τινὰ οἱ παρ Ζηνὸς ἐπέφραδε πότνια μήτηρ,

where however the notion of *bringing* a message is sufficiently prominent to explain the use. So Il. 11. 603 φθεγξάμενος παρὰ νηὸς *sending his voice from the ship*; and Hes. Op. 769 αἶδε γὰρ ἡμέραι εἰσὶ Διὸς πάρα, i. e. *coming from Zeus*. The later use is to

be seen in Emped. 144 θεοῦ πάρα μῦθον ἀκούσας, Xenophanes 3. 1 ἀβροσύνας δὲ μαθόντες ἀνωφελέας παρὰ Λυδῶν.

The original meaning *sideways* or *at the side from* is visible in some of the uses with a Gen. denoting a *thing*: as Il. 4. 468 παρ' ἀσπίδος ἐξεφάνθη *appeared beyond (outside the shelter of) the shield*: so probably Il. 4. 500 νιδὼν Πριάμοιο νόθον βάλε . . παρ' ἱππων ὠκειῶν *struck him (aiming) past the chariot*. So too a sword is drawn παρὰ μηροῦ *sideways from the thigh*. The same meaning lies at the root of the frequent use of παρά in reference to the act of passing from one person to another (as in παραδίδωμι and παραδέχομαι), hence of gifts, messages, &c.

It is usual to regard παρά with the Gen. as meaning *from the side of, from beside, de chez*. But this is contrary to the nature of a prepositional phrase. The Case-ending and the Stem must form a single notion, which the Preposition then modifies; hence (e. g.) παρὰ μηροῦ means *beside from-the-thigh*, not *from beside-the-thigh*. This is especially clear where the Preposition is joined to a Verb; Od. 19. 187 παραπλάξασα Μαλειῶν *driving-aside from-Maleae*: and in—

Il. 4. 97 τοῦ κεν δὴ πάντα παρ' ἀγλαῶ δῶρα φέροιο
the rhythm connects παρά with φέροιο rather than with τοῦ—*thou wilt bring-aside (= trans-fer) from-him*. So with other Prepositions: ἀπὸ Τροίης *off from-Troy*, not *from off-Troy*; κατ' οὐρανοῦ *down from-heaven*, not *from under-heaven*. As to ὑπὸ with the Gen. = *from under*, see § 204.

μετά.

193.] The Preposition μετά in the adverbial use means *mid-way, in the middle*; e. g. with a Verb understood, Il. 2. 446 μετὰ δὲ κτλ. *and among them &c.* Hence alternately, as Od. 15. 460 χρύσειον ὄρμον ἔχων, μετὰ δ' ἡλέκτροισιν ἔεργε *strung with electrum between (the gold)*; so *in succession, afterwards*, as Od. 21. 231 πρῶτος ἐγώ, μετὰ δ' ὕμμες *I first and you in turn*; Od. 15. 400 μετὰ γάρ τε καὶ ἄλγεσι τέρεται ἀνὴρ = *a man has his turn of being pleased even in the course of his sufferings*.

The notion of *alternation* appears in Compounds with μετά, as μεταβάλλω, μεταστρέφω: in Tmesis, Od. 12. 312 μετὰ δ' ἄστροα βέβηκε *the stars have changed their place*. So μεταπαυόμενοι (Il. 17. 373) means *with turns or intervals of rest*.

194.] With the Dative μετά means *between* or (less exactly) *among*. The meaning *between* is found in phrases such as μετὰ χειρὶ, μετὰ ποσσὶ, μετὰ φρεσὶ (on the double character of the φρένες cp. § 181); also, of two *parties*, μετ' ἀμφοτέρου.

The use in reference to several objects (*among*) is mostly restricted to *persons*, since it conveys the idea of *association* of units forming a group, &c. (whereas ἐν is more *local*). Hence μετ' ἀστράσι (Il. 22. 28, 317) is said of a star *among other stars* (with a touch of personification): and in Il. 21. 122 κέϊσο μετ'

ἰχθύσι there is a sarcastic force—*lie there with the fish for company*. Cp. also the phrase Od. 5. 224 μετὰ καὶ τόδε τοῖσι γενέσθω *let this be as one among them*. The expression in Il. 15. 118 μεθ' αἵματι καὶ κονίησι is equivalent to a Collective Noun, = 'the crowd of wounded and fallen.' So Il. 21. 503 μετὰ στροφάλιγγι κονίης, a somewhat bolder phrase of the same kind.

The Dat. with μετὰ is locatival (whereas with σύν and ἅμα it is comitative). This appears in the restriction to Plurals or Collectives, also in the use with Verbs of *motion*, as Il. 4. 16 φιλότῃτα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισι βάλλωμεν (§ 145, 6).

The construction of μετὰ with the Dative is in the main Homeric. It is occasionally imitated in later poetry.

195.] With the Accusative μετὰ has the two meanings *among* and *after*.

The meaning *among* is found after Verbs of motion with Plurals, and also with Collective Nouns, as μεθ' ὁμήγυριν, μεθ' ὄμιλον; so μετὰ δεῖπνον *to (join the company at) a feast*, μετὰ τ' ἦθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων = *to the pasture ground where other horses are*.

It occurs without a Verb of motion in Il. 2. 143 πᾶσι μετὰ πληθύν *to all among the multitude*; Il. 9. 54 μετὰ πάντας ὁμήλικας ἔπλεν ἄριστος (so Od. 16. 419). And with a Singular in Il. 18. 552 δράγματα μετ' ὄγμον πύπτον *the handfuls of corn fell in the middle of the furrow (between the ridges)*.

Of the other meaning we may distinguish the varieties—

- (1) *after, following*; Il. 13. 513 ἐπαίξαι μεθ' ἔδν βέλος *following his weapon*, Od. 2. 406 μετ' ἵχνια βαίνει θεοῖο.
- (2) *after, in order to find* (with a Verb of motion), as μετ' ἔμ' ἦλυθες *has come in search of me*, Od. 1. 184 ἐς Τεμέσην μετὰ χαλκόν.
- (3) *in succession to, next to*; τὸν δὲ μετὰ κτλ. *and after him &c.*; Il. 8. 289 πρῶτῳ τοι μετ' ἐμὲ πρεσβήϊον ἐν χερὶ θήσω *to thee after myself*; of rank, Il. 7. 228 οἶοι . . μετέασι καὶ μετ' Ἀχιλλῆα *even (in the second rank) after Achilles*.

196.] With the Genitive μετὰ occurs in five places (with a Plural Noun), in the meaning *among* or *with*—

Il. 13. 700 μετὰ Βοιωτῶν ἐμάχοντο.

21. 458 οὐδὲ μεθ' ἡμέων πειρᾶ κτλ.

24. 400 τῶν μέτα παλλόμενος κλήρῳ λάχων.

Od. 10. 320 μετ' ἄλλων λέξο ἑταίρων.

16. 140 μετὰ δμῶων τ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ πῖνε κτλ.

Of these instances the first is in a passage probably inserted afterwards to glorify the Athenians; the second is in the θεῶν μάχη, and therefore doubtful; in the third we should perhaps

write μεταπαλλόμενος and construe *of them casting lots in turn I was chosen*. But the last two indicate that the use had crept into colloquial language as early as the *Odyssey*, taking the place of σύν or ἄμα with the Dative. See § 221.

ἐπί.

197.] The Preposition ἐπί means *over, upon*; sometimes *after* (as we speak of following *upon*); *with, at* (i. e. close *upon*); *in addition, besides*, esp. of an addition made to correspond *with* or *complete* something else; also, *attached to*, as an inseparable incident or condition of a person or thing; and conversely, *on the condition, in the circumstances, &c.*

Examples of these meanings in the adverbial use are—

Π. 1. 462 ἐπὶ δ' αἶθοπα οἶνον λείβε poured wine over (the meat).

13. 799 πρὸ μὲν τ' ἄλλ', αὐτὰρ ἐπ' ἄλλα in front—behind.

Od. 1. 273 θεοὶ δ' ἐπὶ μάρτυροι ἔστων the gods be witnesses thereto.

5. 443 ἐπὶ σκέπας ἦν ἀνέμοιο there was thereto (the place was furnished with) a shelter from the wind.

Π. 18. 529 κτείνον δ' ἐπὶ μηλοβοτῆρας killed the shepherds with the sheep.

1. 233 ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι I will swear in confirmation.

With a Verb understood, ἐπί=is present, is in the case, as Od. 2. 58 οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀνὴρ there is no man (for the purpose); Π. 1. 515 οὐ τοι ἐπὶ δέος there is no fear with or for you (as part of your circumstances); Π. 21. 110 ἐπὶ τοι καὶ ἐμοὶ θάνατος death is my lot too (cp. 6. 357 οἶσω ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε κακὸν μόρον).

It is very much used in Composition. Note the meaning *over* in ἐπι-πλέω to sail over, also ἐπι-οίχομαι to go over, review, ἐπι-πωλέομαι, ἐπι-αλόομαι (Π. 17. 650 μάχη δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσα φαδύθη the fight was lighted up all over); besides, in ἐπι-δίδωμι, &c.; to (of bringing aid, joining, &c.) in ἐπι-αρήγω, ἐπι-αλέξω, ἐπι-απαρίσκω, ἐπι-αλλάσσω, &c.; for, in ἐπι-κλώθω to spin for (so as to attach to); hence of assent, ἐπι-νεύω, ἐπι-τλήναι, ἐπι-είκω (with a general affirmative meaning, on as opposed to off, for as opposed to against).

198.] With the Dative ἐπί has the same group of meanings; note especially—

(1) ἐπὶ νηυσὶ by the ships, ἐπ' ὄρεσσι with the sheep (of a shepherd), ἐπὶ κτεάτεσσι with (in charge of) the possessions; Π. 4. 235 ἐπὶ ψευδέσσιιν ἔσσει' ἄρωγός will be a helper with (on the side of) falsehood (or false men, reading ψευδέσσι).

(2) Π. 4. 258 ἀλλοίῳ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ in (engaged upon) other work, so ἀτελευτήτῳ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ with a work unfinished: so Π. 4. 178 ἐπὶ πᾶσι in all cases dealt with.

(3) Od. 17. 454 οὐκ ἄρα σοί γ' ἐπὶ εἶδεϊ καὶ φρένες ἦσαν *with form thou hast not understanding too*; Il. 13. 485 τῷδ' ἐπὶ θυμῷ *with this spirit (too)*; Hes. Theog. 153 ἰσχύς . . μεγάλῃ ἐπὶ εἶδει.

(4) Od. 11. 548 τοῦδ' ἐπ' ἀέθλῳ *with such a prize* (when such a thing is prize); μισθῷ ἐπὶ ῥητῷ *for fixed hire* (given the hire, hence *in view* of it).

(5) ἐπ' ἡματι *for the day*, i. e. *as the day's work, in a single day*.

Note also that ἐπὶ meaning *upon* very often takes the Dat. after Verbs of motion, as κατέχευεν ἐπ' οὔδῃ *poured on to the ground*: hence with the meaning *against*, as ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἰόντες, μάρνασθαι ἐπ' ἀνδράσι, &c.

199.] With the Accusative ἐπὶ implies (1) motion *directed to* a place, seldom (2) to a *person*; or (3) motion or (4) diffusion, extent, &c. *over* a space or (5) time.

1. After Verbs of motion the Acc. does not (like the Dat.) distinctly express that the motion *terminates on* the place: e. g. ἐπὶ χθόνα is merely *to* or *towards* the ground, but ἐπὶ χθονὶ implies *alighting on it*. Cp. Il. 18. 565 ἀταρπιτὸς ἦεν ἐπ' αὐτήν *there was a path leading to it*; Il. 2. 218 ἐπὶ στῆθος συνοχωκότε *bent in over the chest*.

Hence the phrases expressing *attitude*, as ἐπὶ στόμα, ἐπὶ γούνα, &c. Two forms, ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ and ἐπ' ἀριστερά, are used even when motion is not expressed; as Il. 5. 355 εὗρεν ἔπειτα μάχης ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ θούρον Ἄρηα ἤμενον. Note however that ἐπ' ἀριστεροῖς and ἐπ' ἀριστερῶν are metrically impossible.

2. The use with *persons* in the meaning *towards*, in *quest of*, is rare, and almost confined to the Iliad: as 2. 18 βῆ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' Ἀτρεΐδην Ἀγαμέμνονα, τὸν δ' ἐκίχανεν: also 5. 590., 10. 18, 54, 85, 150., 11. 343, 805., 12. 342., 13. 91, 459., 14. 24., 16. 535., 21. 348, Od. 5. 149.

3. The meaning *over*, with Verbs of motion, is very common; ἐπὶ πόντον (ἰών, πλέων, φεύγων, &c.), ἐπὶ γαίαν, ἐπὶ χθόνα, ἐπὶ κύματα, &c. Also with Verbs of *looking*, as Il. 1. 350 ὁρώων ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πόντον.

Hence such phrases as ἐπὶ στίχας, of troops &c. moving *in ranks*, i. e. *over* or *along* certain lines: as Il. 3. 113 ἵππους ἔρυσαν ἐπὶ στίχας: and so Od. 5. 245 ἐπὶ στάθμην ἴθυνε *straightened along* (hence *by*) the rule.

So with Plural Nouns, Il. 14. 381 οἰχόμενοι ἐπὶ πάντας *going over them all*, Od. 15. 492 πολλὰ βροτῶν ἐπὶ ἄστ' ἀλώμενος; and of a distribution, Od. 16. 385 δασσάμενοι κατὰ μοῖραν ἐφ' ἡμέας i. e. *equally*, so as to go round.

4. The instances in which *extent* (without *motion*) is implied are chiefly found in the *Odyssey* (2. 370, &c.). Examples from the *Iliad* are: 9. 506 φθάσει δέ τε πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν *she is beforehand all the world over* (so 23. 742): 10. 213 κλέος εἶη πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, 24. 202, 535. It will be seen that they are from books 9, 10, 23, 24.

Notice also the use with Neuters expressing *quantity*; as Il. 5. 772 τόσσον ἐπὶ θρόσκουσι *to such a distance they bound*; also ἐπὶ πολλόν *a long way*, ἐπὶ ἴσα *to an equal extent*; and esp. the common phrase ὅσον τ' ἐπί, see Il. 2. 616, &c.

5. Of *time*: Il. 2. 299 μέινει' ἐπὶ χρόνον *wait for* (lit. *over*) *a time*; Od. 7. 288 εὖδον παννύχιοι καὶ ἐπ' ἡῷ καὶ μέσον ἡμῶν *slept all night and on through morning and midday*.

200.] **The Genitive with ἐπί** is used in nearly the same sense as the Dative, but usually with less definitely local force; in particular—

- (1) with words expressing the great divisions of space, esp. when a contrast is involved (land and sea, &c.); as ἐπὶ χέρσου, ἐπ' ἡπείρου, ἐπ' ἀγροῦ; Od. 12. 27 ἡ ἀλὸς ἢ ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλγήσετε (cp. Il. 13. 565). This is evidently a Gen. of place, § 149. For the difference of Gen. and Dat. cp. Il. 1. 485 ἐπ' ἡπείροιο ἔρυσσαν ὕψου ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις.
- (2) where the local relation is a familiar one; as ἐπὶ νηός, ἐπ' ἀπήνης, ἐφ' ἱππων, ἐπὶ θρόνου, ἐπ' οὐδοῦ, ἐπὶ πύργου, ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος, ἐπὶ μελίσς (ἐρεισθείς). Thus ἐπὶ νηυσὶ means *on or beside ships*, ἐπὶ νηῶν *on board ships*.
- (3) with Verbs of motion, *upon* (of the *terminus ad quem*), as Il. 3. 293 κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ χθονός; so *bearing down on*, as Il. 3. 6 πέτονται ἐπ' Ὠκεανοῖο ῥόων: Il. 5. 700 προτρέποντο μελαινάων ἐπὶ νηῶν: Od. 3. 171 νεοίμεθα νήσου ἐπὶ Ψυρίης *taking the course by the island Psyria*. So perhaps Il. 7. 195 (εὐχέσθαι) σιγῇ ἐφ' ὑμείων (*keeping the words*) *to yourselves*.
- (4) of *time*; ἐπ' εἰρήνης (Il. 2. 797, &c.); ἐπὶ προτέρων ἀνθρώπων (Il. 5. 637, &c.). Cp. the Gen. of Time, § 150.

In later prose the Gen. is very common, and the uses become indistinguishable from those of the Dat.

ὑπό.

201.] **The Preposition ὑπό** (also ὑπαί) usually means *beneath*, as in Il. 2. 95 ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα *the earth groaned beneath (their tread)*. The original sense, however, seems to have been *upwards*, as in the Superlative ὑπ-ατος *uppermost* (cp. ὕψι aloft, ὑπ-τιος *facing upwards*). On this view we can understand why

ὕπο is not applied (like κατά) to express *downward* motion. Hence, too, it is especially used of *supporting* a thing, as Il. 1. 486 ὑπὸ δ' ἔρματα μακρὰ τάνυσσαν: and on the same principle it expresses resistance to a motion (whereas κατά implies *yielding*, going *with the stream* &c.); as Il. 5. 505 ὑπὸ δ' ἔστρεφον ἡνιοχῆς *the drivers wheeled them up*, i. e. *to face* (the Trojans): and so ὑπ-αντιάσας *meeting face to face*, ὑπο-μένω *to stand against* (as we say, *up to*); and with the derived notion of *answering*, ὑπ-αἶδω *I sing in correspondence*, ὑπο-κρίνομαι (= Att. ἀποκρίνομαι), ὑπο-βάλλω *I take up* (a speaker), ὑπ-ακούω *I hear in reply*, i. e. *show that I hear* (by answering or obeying).

So too the Compounds ὑφ-ορῶ, ὑπ-όψιος, ὑπό-δρα, &c. do not express looking *down*, but looking *upwards from under*; even in Il. 3. 217 στάσκειν ὑπαὶ δὲ ἴδεσκε κατά χθονὸς ὄμματα πῆξας it is the *face* that is bent downwards: cp. Il. 19. 17.

From the notion of being *immediately under* is derived that of being moved *by*, i. e. of *agency* or *cause*. The transition may be seen in ὑπο-εἰκω *I give way (before)*, ὑπο-τρέω &c.; so Il. 16. 333 ὑπεθερμάνθη *was warmed by (the blood)*.

202.] With the Dative ὑπό is very common in the simple local meaning, *under*. It is sometimes found with Verbs of motion, as Od. 4. 297 δέμνι' ὑπ' αἰθούσῃ θέμεναι; and even when motion *from* is intended, in Il. 18. 244 ἔλυσαν ὑφ' ἄρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους. In this case however we have to consider that ἀρμάτων is metrically impossible.

The derived sense *under the charge* or *power* is found in such uses as Il. 5. 231 ὑφ' ἡνιόχῳ (of horses), 6. 139 Ζεὺς γάρ οἱ ὑπὸ σκῆπτρῳ ἐδάμασσε, 6. 171 θεῶν ὑπ' ἀμύμονι πομπῇ: also, with the notion of an effect produced (where the Gen. would therefore be rather more natural), ὑπὸ χειρὶ (δαμῆναι, θανέειν, &c.), ὑπὸ δουρὶ (τυπεῖς, &c.); Il. 13. 667 νούσῳ ὑπ' ἀργαλῇ φθίσθαι, Od. 4. 295 ὑπνῳ ὑπο γλυκερῷ ταρπόμεθα: and often of *persons*, as Il. 5. 93 ὑπὸ Τυδείδῃ πυκινὰ κλονέοντο φάλαγγες.

203.] The Accusative is used with ὑπό (1) of motion *to a point under*, as—

Il. 2. 216 ὑπὸ Ἰλίου ἦλθε *came under (the walls of) Troy*.

17. 309 τὸν βάλ' ὑπὸ κληῖδα μέσσην (so often with Verbs of *striking*, &c.).

Also (2) of motion *passing under*, and hence of *extent under*: Od. 15. 349 εἴ που ἐτι ζῶουσιν ὑπ' αὐγὰς ἡελίου i. e. *anywhere that the sun shines* (cp. ὑπ' ἡῷ τ' ἡελίον τε—an equivalent phrase).

Il. 2. 603 οἱ δ' ἔχον Ἀρκαδίην ὑπὸ Κυλλήνης ὄρος.

3. 371 ἀγχε δέ μιν πολύκεστος ἱμᾶς ἀπαλὴν ὑπὸ δειρήν (i. e. *passing under the throat*).

In one or two places it is applied to *time* : Π. 16. 202 πάνθ' ὑπὸ μνηθμόν *all the time that my anger lasted* ; so perhaps Π. 22. 102 νύχθ' ὑπο τήνδ' ὀλοήν (but night is often regarded as a *space* of darkness).

204.] The Genitive with ὑπό is found in two or three distinct uses :—

- (1) with the force of *separation from* : as Π. 17. 235 νεκρὸν ὑπ' Αἰαντος ἐρβύν *from under Ajax* ; Od. 9. 463 ὑπ' ἀρνειοῦ λυόμεν ; so Π. 19. 17 ὅσσε δεινὸν ὑπὸ βλεφάρων ὥς εἰ σέλας ἐξεφάανθεν.

In this use the Gen. is ablative, cp. § 152. Originally ὑπό with an Abl. probably meant *upwards from* : see § 192.

- (2) of *place under*, with *contact* (especially of a *surface*) ; as—

Π. 8. 14 ὑπὸ χθονός ἐστι βέρεθρον.

Od. 5. 346 τόδε κρήδεμνον ὑπὸ στέρνοιο τανύσσαι.

Π. 1. 501 δεξιτερῇ δ' ἄρ' ὑπ' ἀνθρεῶνος ἐλοῦσα *taking hold of him under the chin*.

4. 106 ὑπὸ στέρνοιο τυχήσας.

16. 375 ὕψι δ' ἄελλα σκίδναθ' ὑπὸ νεφέων, i.e. *seeming to reach the clouds* (cp. 15. 625., 23. 874).

These uses of the Gen. are evidently parallel to some of those discussed in § 149 and § 151 ; compare (e.g.) ὑπὸ νεφέων with the Gen. of *space within* which (πεδίοιο διώκειν, &c.), and ὑπ' ἀνθρεῶνος ἐλοῦσα with κόμης ἔλε (§ 151 a) *took by the hair*. They are doubtless to be regarded (like the Gen. with ἐπί, § 200) as varieties or developments of the Genitive of Place.

As with the Dative, the notion *under* passes into—

- (3) the metaphorical (or half metaphorical) meaning *under the influence of*, *by the power of* ; as Π. 3. 61 ὅς τ' εἴσω διὰ δουρὸς ὑπ' ἀνέρος *under the man's hand* ; Od. 19. 114 ἀρετῶσι δὲ λαοὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ *under his rule* ; and many similar uses.

Cases may be noted in which the agency intended is *indirect* (where later writers would rather use διὰ with an Acc.) :—

Π. 16. 590 ἦν ῥά τ' ἀνὴρ ἀφ' ἧς πειρώμενος ἦ ἐν ἀέθλῳ

ἦ καὶ ἐν πολέμῳ δητῶν ὑπο θυμοραϊστέων,

= *under the stress of an enemy* (so 18. 220) ;

Π. 23. 86 εὐτέ με . . ἦγαγεν ὑμέτερόνδ' ἀνδροκτασίης ὑπὸ λυγρῆς *by reason of a homicide (committed by me)*.

As a sound is said to be *over* or *about* (περί, ἀμφί) the person hearing, so he is *under* the sound : hence (e.g.) with a half metaphorical meaning Π. 15. 275 τῶν δέ θ' ὑπὸ λαχῆς ἐφάνη λῖς. So of other accompaniments, as Π. 18. 492 δαΐδων ὑπο λαμπομενάων *by the light of blazing torches*.

πρὸς.

205.] The Preposition **πρὸς** (**πρός, ποτί**) expresses attitude or direction *towards* an object. It is found in the adverbial use; Od. 5. 255 *πρὸς δ' ἄρα πηδάλιον ποιήσατο* *he made a rudder to be put to (the raft)*; hence commonly *in addition, besides*—a use which remained in later Greek.

It is a question whether **πρὸς** and **ποτί** are originally the same word. The present text of Homer does not indicate any difference of usage.

206.] With the Dative **πρὸς** means *resting on, against, beside* a thing: as Il. 4. 112 *ποτὶ γαίῃ ἀγκλῖνας* *resting (the bow) against the ground*: Od. 5. 329 *πρὸς ἀλλήλησιν ἔχονται* *hold on to one another*. With Verbs of motion it implies that the motion *ends on or beside* the object; Od. 9. 459 *θεινομένον πρὸς οὐδεῖ*.

The later meaning *besides, in addition*, is only found in Od. 10. 68 *ἄσάν μ' ἔταροί τε κακοὶ πρὸς τοῖσί τε ὕπνος*.

207.] With the Accusative **πρὸς** is very common, meaning *towards*: as *πρὸς πόλιν* *towards the city* (not necessarily reaching it), Il. 8. 364 *κλαίσκε πρὸς οὐρανόν* *cried out to heaven*; hence *to, on to* (mostly with Verbs of motion), as Od. 4. 42 *ἐκλίwan πρὸς ἐνώπια* *leaned against the walls*: *against* (persons), as *πρὸς δαίμονα φωτὶ μάχεσθαι* *to fight with a man in opposition to a god*; also *addressing* (persons), with Verbs of speaking, &c.; in one place of time, Od. 17. 191 *ποτὶ ἔσπερα* *towards evening*.

Note that the literal local sense appears in all the Homeric uses of **πρὸς** with the Acc.: the metaphorical uses, viz. *in respect of, for the purpose of, in proportion to, according to, &c.*, are later.

208.] With the Genitive **πρὸς** expresses *direction* without the idea of motion *towards* or rest *on* the object: as Od. 13. 110 *αἱ μὲν πρὸς βορέαο . . αἱ δ' αὖ πρὸς νότον* *i. e. not at or facing the north and south, but more generally, in the direction fixed by north and south*; Il. 10. 428–430 *πρὸς μὲν ἀλδς . . πρὸς Θύμβρης*: Il. 22. 198 *ποτὶ πτόλιος* *in the direction of Troy*; Od. 8. 29 *ἥε πρὸς ἠοίων ἥ ἐσπερίων ἀνθρώπων* (= *from east or west*).

Among derived senses we may distinguish—

- (1) *at the hand of, from* (persons), as Il. 1. 160 *τιμὴν ἀρνύμενοι πρὸς Τρώων*, Il. 831 *τά σε ποτὶ φασιν Ἀχιλλῆος δεδιδάχθαι*.
- (2) *on the part of, by the will of*, as Il. 1. 239 *οἱ τε θέμιστας πρὸς Διὸς εἰρύεται* *who uphold judgments on behalf of Zeus*; Il. 6. 456 *πρὸς ἄλλης ἰστον ὑφαίνους* *at another's bidding*: and, perhaps in a metaphorical sense, Od. 6. 207 *πρὸς γὰρ Διὸς εἰσιν ἅπαντες ξείνοί τε πτωχοί τε*.

- (3) *before, by* (in oaths and entreaties); as Il. 13. 324 πρὸς πατρός γουνάζομαι *I entreat in the name of thy father*. The Preposition here implies that the god or person sworn by is made a party to the act; cp. Od. 11. 66 νῦν δέ σε τῶν ὀπιθεῖν γουνάζομαι οὐ παρεόντων, πρὸς τ' ἀλόχου καὶ πατρός κτλ. *on the part of the absent ones I entreat &c.*

It will be seen that προτί with a Gen. is seldom used in the strictly local sense except when there is a *contrast between two directions*. Hence the use approaches closely to that of the Gen. of Place given in § 149 (2); compare (*e.g.*) πρὸς βορέαο—πρὸς νότον with Od. 1. 24 οἱ μὲν δυσομένον Ὑπερίωνος οἱ δ' ἀνιόντος. The Case is accordingly 'quasi-partitive' (*i.e.* true) Genitive, and has no ablative character.

ἀνά.

209.] **The Preposition ἀνά (ἀν)** means *up, upwards, up through*. It is rarely used as a pure Adverb (the form ἀνω being preferred) except in the elliptical ἀνα *up!* But it has a derivative adverbial sense in Il. 18. 562 μέλαρες δ' ἀνὰ βότρυες ἦσαν *there were dark grapes throughout*. Tmesis may be seen in Il. 2. 278 ἀνὰ δ' ὁ πολλίπορθος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔστη, and in ἀνὰ δ' ἔσχετο (ἀνέσχετο), &c. In Tmesis and Composition it sometimes expresses *reverse action*, as ἀνα-λύω. So ἀνα-βάλλω *to put off*.

ἀνά is seldom used with the **Dative**; the meaning is *up on* (a height of some kind), as Il. 1. 15 χρυσέῳ ἀνὰ σκήπτρῳ *raised on a golden staff*; 15. 152 ἀνὰ Γαργάρῳ; so 8. 441., 14. 352., 18. 177., Od. 11. 128., 23. 275., 24. 8. This use is occasionally found in Pindar (Ol. 8. 67, Pyth. 1. 10), and lyric parts of tragedy, but is not Attic.

With the **Genitive** ἀνά is only used in three places in the Odyssey (2. 416., 9. 177., 15. 284), and only of going on board a ship (ἀνὰ νηὸς βαίνω). The meaning *up from* is only found in Composition: ἀνέδν πολλῆς ἀλός, &c.

210.] **With the Accusative ἀνά** means *up along, up through*, of motion or extent: ἀνὰ ἄστν, ἀμ πεδίον, ἀνὰ δώματα, ἀν' ὁδόν, ἀν' Ἑλλάδα, &c.; Il. 5. 74 ἀν' ὁδοντας ὑπὸ γλῶσσαν τάμε χαλκός *the spear cut its way up through the teeth and under the tongue*; so ἀνὰ στόμα, used literally (Il. 16. 349., 22. 452, &c.), and also of words uttered, Il. 2. 250 βασιλῆας ἀνὰ στόμ' ἔχων *having the kings passing through your mouth (i.e. talking freely of them)*; similarly ἀνὰ θυμόν of thoughts rising in the mind. Note also the application to *mixing*, as Od. 4. 41 πᾶρ δ' ἔβαλον ζεῖας, ἀνὰ δὲ κρή λευκὸν ἔμιξαν; cp. Od. 9. 209 (with the note in Merry and Riddell's edition). The Accusative is evidently one of Space (§ 138).

The use with collective Nouns, as *ἀν' ὄμιλον through the press, μάχην ἀνά, ἄμ φόνον ἀν νέκρας*, &c. seems to be peculiar to the *Iliad*.

The use in *Il. 14. 80 ἀνά νύκτα* may be explained either of *time* or of *space*: cp. *ὑπὸ νύκτα* (§ 203), *διὰ νύκτα* (§ 215).

The meaning *up on, up to* (of motion) may be traced in *Il. 10. 466 θῆκεν ἀνὰ μυρτίκην*: *Od. 22. 176 κίον' ἀν' ὑψηλὴν ἐρύσαι draw (the cord) up to a high pillar*; perhaps in the phrase *ἀνὰ θ' ἄρματα ποικίλ' ἐβαινον* (*Od. 3. 492, &c.*).

κατά.

211.] The Preposition *κατά* (by Apocope *κάδ*, &c.) means *down*, and is parallel in most uses to *ἀνά*. It is never purely adverbial (*κάτω* being used instead, cp. *ἄνω*), but is common in *Tmesis*, as *Il. 1. 436 κατά δὲ πρυμνήσι' ἔδησαν*, *19. 334 κατά πάντων τεθνάμεν*, &c., and in *Composition*. Besides the primary sense (seen in *κατ-άγω I bring down, κατα-νεύω I nod downwards, i. e. in assent, &c.*) it often has the meaning *all over*, as *κατα-εινύω I clothe, καταχέω I pour over*; hence *completely*, as *κατὰ πάντα φαγεῖν to eat all up, κατα-κτείνω I kill outright*: also *in the place, as before*, as *καταλείπω I leave where it was, &c.*

κατά is not used with the **DATIVE**. If such a use ever existed it was superseded by *ὑπὸ* (just as *ἀνά* with the **DAT.** gave way to *ἐπί*). The possibility of the combination may be seen from the phrases *κατ' αὐτόθι, κατ' αὐθι*.

212.] With the **ACCUSATIVE** *κατά* means *down along, down through*, as *κατὰ ῥέον down stream*; cp. *Il. 16. 349 ἀνὰ στόμα καὶ κατὰ ῥίνας* (of blood). But it is very often used (like *ἀνά*) of motion that is not upward or downward, except from some arbitrary point of view; as *καθ' ὁδὸν along the way, κατὰ πτόλιν through the city, &c.*: again, *κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν in mind and spirit*.

Other varieties of use are:—

- (1) with collective Nouns (chiefly in the *Iliad*), as *κατὰ στρατόν through the camp, πόλεμον κάτα, κατὰ κλόνον, &c.*
- (2) with Plurals (less common), as *κατ' αὐτοὺς going among them, κατ' ἀνθρώπους ἀλάλησθαι*.
- (3) of the character or general description of an action, as *κατὰ πρῆξιν (ἀλάλησθε) on a piece of business, ἦλθον κατὰ χρέος, πλαζόμενοι κατὰ ληίδα* (all in the *Odyssey*).
- (4) to express place; esp. of wounds, e. g. *κατ' ὤμον about (somewhere on) the shoulder*. Cp. *Il. 1. 484 ἵκοντο κατὰ στρατόν arrived opposite (within the space adjoining) the camp*; *Od. 5. 441 ποταμοῖο κατὰ στόμα ἔξε νέων*.

- (5) to express *agreement* (from the notion of *falling in with*), in the phrases *κατὰ θυμόν, κατὰ κόσμον, κατὰ μοῖραν, κατ' αἴσαν*.
 (6) distributively: as II. 2. 99 *ἐρήτυθεν δὲ καθ' ἑδρας* in *their several seats*; and so in 2. 362 *κρῖν' ἄνδρας κατὰ φύλα κατὰ φρήτρας*.
 (7) *κατὰ σφέας (μάχεσθαι)* by themselves (to the extent constituted by themselves): so II. 1. 271 *κατ' ἑμ' αὐτόν*.

These uses may generally be identified in principle with some of the Accusatives mentioned in §§ 136-138. Thus the Acc. in *ἦλθον κατὰ χρέος* is like *ἀγγελίην ἐλθεῖν*: in *κατὰ κόσμον* it is like the adverbial *δέμας, ἄκην, &c.*: *κρίνε κατὰ φύλα* = *μοίρας δάσασθαι*; and *κατ' ἑμὸν* like the Acc. of the 'part affected.'

213.] With the Genitive *κατά* has two chief meanings:—

- (1) *down from*; as *κατ' οὐρανοῦ* down from heaven, *καθ' ἵππων ἄλτο* leaped from the chariot. This Genitive is clearly ablative in origin.
 (2) *down on (in, over, &c.)*: as II. 3. 217 *κατὰ χθονὸς ὄμματα πήξας* fixing his eyes on the ground; *κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυν' ἀγλὺς* a mist was shed over his eyes; *κατὰ γαίης* down in the earth.

Comparing the similar uses of *ἐπὶ* (§ 200), *ὑπὸ* (§ 204, 2), and *πρὸς* (§ 208), we can hardly doubt that the Gen. in this latter group is originally akin to the Genitives of Place (§ 149).

ΔΙΑ.

214.] The Preposition *διά* seems to mean properly *apart, in twain*. It is not used freely as an Adverb; but the original sense appears in the combinations *διαπρό, διαμπερές*, and in Tmesis and Composition, as *δια-σῆναι* to stand apart; *δια-τάμνω* I cut asunder; *διὰ κτήσιν* *δαρέοντο* divided the possession. From the notion of going through it means *thoroughly*, as in *δια-πέρθω* I sack utterly.

In several Compounds, as *δια-τάμνω, δι-αιρέω, δια-δάπτω*, the notion of division is given by the Preposition to the Verb; e.g. *δια-τάμνω* I separate by cutting, &c.

215.] The Accusative with *διά* is often used to denote the space through which motion takes place: as—

II. 1. 600 *διὰ δώματα ποιπνύοντα* bustling through the palace (so *διὰ σπέος, διὰ βήσσης, διὰ βωπήια, &c.*).

14. 91 *μῦθον ὃν οὐ κεν ἀνήρ γε διὰ στόμα πάμπαν ἀγοιτο* (=with which a man would not sully his mouth: cp. *ἀνὰ στόμα, § 210*).

Od. 9. 400 *ῥέκον ἐν σπήεσσι δι' ἄκριας* dwell in caves about (scattered through) the headlands.

So Il. 2. 40 διὰ κρατερὰς ὑσμῖνας *lasting through hard fights*: and διὰ νύκτα (chiefly in the Odyssey, and books 10 and 24 of the Iliad).

This use is distinctively Homeric. Sometimes also διὰ with the Acc. is used in Homer to express *cause* or *agency*; as Il. 1. 73 ἦν διὰ μαντοσύνην (Calchas led the army) *by virtue of his soothsaying*; Od. 8. 520 διὰ μεγάθυμον Ἀθήνην (to conquer) *by the help of Athene*; so Il. 10. 497., 15. 41, 71, Od. 8. 82., 11. 276, 282, 437., 13. 121., 19. 154, 523. These places do not show the later distinction between *by means of* and *by reason of*.

216.] The Genitive with διὰ implies passing *through* something in order to get *beyond* it; esp. getting through some *obstacle*: as—

Il. 4. 135 διὰ μὲν ἄρ ζωστήρος ἐλήλατο.

So of a gate, Il. 3. 263 διὰ Σκαιῶν ἔχον ἵππους: and of lower and upper air, &c. δι' ἥρος αἰθέρ' ἴκανε, δι' αἰθέρος οὐρανὸν ἴκε, πεδίουδε διὰ νεφέων. So again διὰ προμάχων, δι' ὀμίλου &c. of making way through the press.

The Acc. is used where we expect this Gen. in Il. 7. 247 ἐξ δὲ διὰ πύχας ἦλθε *went through six folds*: but this may be partly due to the metrical impossibility of πυχῶν. Conversely, in Il. 10. 185 ὅς τε καθ' ἕλην ἔρχεται δι' ὄρεσφι the Acc. would be right, and ὄρεσφι is perhaps a false archaism: but cp. § 158.

ὑπέρ.

217.] The Preposition ὑπέρ (or ὑπείρ) means *higher*, hence *over*, *beyond*. It is not found in the adverbial use, or in Tmesis, or with a Dative.

In Composition ὑπέρ expresses going *across* or *beyond*, hence *excess*, violation of limits, &c.

218.] With the Accusative ὑπέρ is used—

- (1) of motion or extent *over* a space, as Il. 23. 227 ὑπείρ ἄλα κίδναται ἥως. This use is not common; Il. 12. 289., 24. 13, Od. 3. 68., 4. 172., 9. 254, 260.
- (2) of motion *passing over* an object: as Il. 5. 16 ὑπὲρ ὤμων, ἀριστερὸν ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή; Od. 7. 135 ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσετο.
- (3) metaphorically, *in excess of*, *in violation of*: ὑπὲρ αἶσαν, ὑπὲρ μοῖραν, ὑπὲρ ὅρκια: also, somewhat differently, Il. 17. 327 ὑπὲρ θεόν *in spite of God*.

219.] With the Genitive ὑπέρ is used both of position and of motion *over* an object, esp. at some distance from it; as στή δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς; Il. 15. 382 νηὶς ὑπὲρ τοίχων (of a wave com-

ing) *over the sides of a ship*: Il. 23. 327 ὅσον τ' ὄργυι' ὑπὲρ αἴης *a fathom's length above ground*.

Metaphorically it means *over* so as to protect, hence *in defence of, on behalf of*; as Il. 7. 449 τεῖχος ἐτειχίσσαντο νεῶν ὑπὲρ; Il. 1. 444 ἐκατόμβην ῥέξαι ὑπὲρ Δαναῶν. So Il. 6. 524 ὅθ' ὑπὲρ σέθεν αἰσχέ' ἀκούω *when I listen to reproaches on your account* (of which I bear the brunt). But Hes. Op. 217 δίκη δ' ὑπὲρ ὕβριος ἴσχει *justice rises (prevails) over insolence*.

In respect of form ὑπὲρ (for ὑπέρι, Sanscr. *upári*) is a Comparative of ὑπό; cp. the Superlative ὑπατος, and the Lat. *superus, summus*. Hence the Gen. is ablatival, like the Gen. with words of comparison; see § 152.

ἐνί.

220.] The Preposition ἐνί (also εἰνί, εἰν, ἐν) means *within, in*; it is used adverbially (as Il. 5. 740 ἐν δ' ἔρις, ἐν δ' ἀλή &c.), in Tmesis (as ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρί), and with a (locative) Dative.

Notice, as departures from the strict local sense, the uses—

(1) with Plurals denoting persons (= μετὰ *among*), as ἐν ὑμῖν (Il. 9. 121, 528., 10. 445), ἐν πᾶσι (Od. 2. 194., 16. 378), ἐνὶ σφίσι (Il. 23. 703).

(2) with abstract words (rare in the Iliad); ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι (Il. 10. 245, 279), ἐν πάντεσσ' ἔργοισι (Il. 23. 671), ἐν ἀλγεσι (Il. 24. 568); θαλίῃ ἐνι (Il. 9. 143, 285), ἐν νηπιέῃ (Il. 9. 491); ἐν φιλότῃ; ἐν μοίρῃ *aright* (Il. 19. 186), αἴσῃ ἐν ἀργαλίῃ (Il. 22. 61), ἐν Κάρῃ αἴσῃ (Il. 9. 378); ἐν δὲ ἡ τιμῇ (Il. 9. 319).

These two uses are nearly confined in the Iliad to books 9, 10, 23, 24.

σύν.

221.] The Preposition σύν (or ξύν) means *in company with*. It is not used as a pure Adverb, but is found in Tmesis, as Il. 1. 579 σὺν δ' ἡμῖν δαῖτα ταραξή *and disturb (συνταράσσω) our feast*. It is used with an Instrumental Dative (§ 144).

To express *equally with, or at the same time as*, Homer uses ἄμα with a Dat.; while σύν commonly means *attended by, with the help of, &c.* Hence σὺν ἔντεσι *with armour on*, σὺν νηυσὶ *in ships*, σὺν ὄρκῳ *on oath*, σὺν Ἀθήνῃ *aided by Athene*: so Il. 4. 161 σύν τε μεγάλῳ ἀπέτισαν *they pay with a great price*.

The use of σύν with the Dative has been recently shown by Tycho Mommsen to be confined, generally speaking, to poetry. The Attic prose writers (with the singular exception of Xenophon) use μετὰ with the Gen.; the practice of the poets varies, from Homer, who hardly ever uses μετὰ with the Gen., down to Euripides, who uses it about half as often as σύν. It is evident that in

post-Homeric times *μερά* with the Gen. became established in the ordinary colloquial language, while *σύν* with the dat. was retained as a piece of poetical style, but gradually gave way to living usage. See Tycho Mommsen's dissertation *Μερά, σύν und άμα bei den Epikern* (Frankfurt am Main, 1874).

εις.

222.] The Preposition *εις* (or *ές*) expresses motion to or into. It is not used adverbially (the Adverb being *είσω*), and seldom in Tmesis: Il. 8. 115 τῷ δ' *εις* ἀμφοτέρῳ Διομήδεος ἄρματα βήτην.

The motion is sometimes *implied*: as Il. 15. 275 ἐφάνη λῖς ἠϋγένειος *εις* ὁδόν: 16. 574 ἐς Πηλῆϊ ἰκέτευσε (*came as suppliant*).

Of time; ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα *to sun-set*; so ἐς τί *how long?* *εις* ὃ *until*: Od. 14. 384 ἐς θέρος ἢ ἐς ὀπώρην *as late as summer or autumn*.

Metaphorical uses: Il. 2. 379 εἰ δέ ποτ' ἐς γε μίαν βουλεύσομεν *if we take counsel to one purpose*; Il. 9. 102 εἰπεῖν *εις* ἀγαθόν *to speak to good effect* (so 11. 789., 23. 305).

ἐξ.

223.] The Preposition *ἐξ* (or *έκ*) usually expresses motion out from an object. It is not used purely adverbially, but there are many examples of Tmesis: as ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο, ἐκ δέ οἱ ἥνιοχος πλῆγη φρένας *his charioteer lost* (lit. *was struck out of*) *his wits*, ἐκ τε καὶ ὅψε' τελεῖ (Il. 4. 161) *he brings it to pass* (ἐκτελεῖ) *late*.

With a Gen. (ablative) *ἐξ* is used of motion *from* or *out of*. Sometimes the idea of motion is *implied*:—

Il. 13. 301 ἐκ Θρήκης Ἐφύρους μέτα θωρήσσεσθον *armed themselves to come from Thrace after the Ephyri*.

14. 129 ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτ' αὐτοὶ μὲν ἐχώμεθα δηϊοτήτος ἐκ βελέων *hold back from fighting (going) out of range*: cp. 16. 122, 678., 18. 152.

So of *direction*: Il. 14. 153 Ἥρῃ δ' εἰσεῖδε . . σῆας' ἐξ Οὐλύμ-
ποιο *stood and looked from Olympus*; Od. 21. 420 (drew the bow) αὐτόθεν ἐκ δίφροιο καθήμενος *from the chair as he sat*; Il. 19. 375 ὅτ' ἂν ἐκ πόντοιο σέλας ναύτησι φανῇ *when a meteor appears to sailors at sea* (seeing it from the sea): of *choosing* out of, Il. 15. 680 ἐκ πολέων πλόνυρας συναείρεται ἵππους, and similarly, Il. 18. 431 ὅσσ' ἐμοὶ ἐκ πασέων Κρονίδης Ζεὺς ἄλγε' ἔδωκε *to me* (*taken from, hence*) *more than all*.

ἐξ is also used of an *agent* as the *source* of action; as Il. 5. 384 τλήμεν . . ἐξ ἀνδρῶν *have endured at the hands of men*; cp. Il. 22. 280, Od. 7. 70., 9. 512: also Il. 24. 617 θεῶν ἐκ κήδεα πέσσει *endures heaven-sent troubles*, and Hes. Theog. 94 ἐκ γὰρ Μουσῶν καὶ ἐκ ῥόλου Ἀπόλλωνος ἀνδρες ἀοιδοὶ ἔασιν. The meaning in

consequence of (a thing) occurs in Il. 9. 566 ἐξ ἀρέων μητρὸς κεχολωμένος, and in the Odyssey (3. 135., 5. 468, &c.).

Of time: ἐκ τοῖο from that time, ἐξ ἀρχῆς from the first (Od. 1. 188, &c.), ἐκ νεότητος (Il. 14. 86).

With an abstract word, Il. 10. 107 ἐκ χόλου ἀργαλέοιο μεταστρέψῃ φίλον ἦτορ. Note also: Il. 10. 68 πατρόθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων calling them by the father's name according to family; Il. 9. 343 (486) ἐκ θυμοῦ from the heart, heartily (but Il. 23. 595 ἐκ θυμοῦ πεσέειν to fall away from a person's favour).

ἀπό.

224.] The Preposition ἀπό means off, away, at a distance from. It is not used adverbially, but is common in Tmesis; as Il. 8. 108 οὓς ποτ' ἀπ' Αἰνείαν ἐλόμην which I took from Aeneas. In Composition it generally gives the Verb the notion of separating; e.g. ἀπο-κόπτω is not I hew at a distance, but I separate by hewing: so ἀπεκόσμεον cleared away (Od. 7. 232), and similarly ἀποδύω, ἀποβάλλω, ἀπολούω, ἀπορρήγνυμι, ἀποκαπύω (all used in Tmesis). Hence we must explain Il. 19. 254 ἀπὸ τρίχας ἀρξάμενος cutting hair as an ἀπαρχή, or first offering; cp. Od. 3. 446., 14. 422.

Sometimes ἀπό has the force of restoration or return, as in ἀποδίδωμι, ἀπο-νοστέω (cp. ἀψ backwards). So ἀπο-ειπεῖν means either to speak out or to forbid, refuse. In a few cases it has an intensive force, as in ἀπομηνίω, ἀπήχθετο, ἀποθαυμάζω.

With the Genitive ἀπό generally expresses motion away from, not implying previous place within the object (whereas ἐξ means proceeding from). It is also used of position, as Il. 8. 16 ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης as far as heaven is from earth; Od. 1. 49 φίλων ἀπο πῆματα πάσχει suffers woes far from his friends; metaphorically, Il. 1. 562 ἀπὸ θυμοῦ μᾶλλον ἔμοι ξεσεῖ you will be the more out of favour with me; ἀπὸ δόξης away from expectation. This Gen. is clearly ablative.

πρό.

225.] The Preposition πρό means forward, in front. It is seldom used as an Adverb; Il. 13. 799 πρὸ μέν τ' ἄλλ., κτλ.; Il. 16. 188 ἐξάγαγε πρὸ φώωσδε brought forth to the light: and of time, Il. 1. 70 πρὸ τ' ἐόντα the past. In one or two other instances we may recognise either the free adverbial use or Tmesis: Il. 1. 195 πρὸ γὰρ ἦκε, 1. 442 πρὸ μ' ἔπεμψε, Od. 1. 37 πρὸ οἱ εἵπομεν.

Traces of a use of πρό with the Locative may be seen in the phrases οὐρανόθι πρό in the face of heaven, Ἰλιόθι πρό in front of Troy, and (perhaps in the temporal sense) ἠῶθι πρό before dawn. In these cases the meaning is to the front in, hence immediately before.

With a Genitive, on the other hand, *πρό* means *in front with respect to, in advance of*; hence, in a more or less metaphorical sense, *in defence of*, as Il. 8. 57 *πρό τε παίδων καὶ πρό γυναικῶν*. The Case is here the ablative Gen. (as with *ὑπέρ* and words of comparison).

But in Il. 4. 382 *πρό ὁδοῦ ἐγένοντο* the Gen. is partitive, *got forward on the way*; and so perhaps Il. 16. 667 *πρό φόβοιο* *forward in the flight*, i.e. *having betaken themselves to flight* (so Düntzer *a. l.*).

The temporal sense is rare in Homer; Od. 15. 524., 17. 476 *πρό γάμοιο* *before marriage*; Il. 10. 224 *καὶ τε πρό ὃ τοῦ ἐνόησε* *one thinks of a thing before another*.

ἀντί.

226.] The only certain Compound with *ἀντί* in Homer appears to be *ἀντι-φέρεισθαι* *to oppose* (Il. 1. 589., 5. 701., 22. 482, Od. 16. 238): for the Verbs *ἀντιβολέω* *meet* and *ἀντιτορέω* *pierce* may be derived from the Nouns *ἀντι-βολος*, *ἀντι-τορος*: also in Il. 8. 163 we may read *γυναικὸς ἄρ' ἀντὶ τέτυξο*, not *ἀντετέτυξο* (cp. Od. 8. 546 *ἀντὶ κασιγνήτου ξείνός θ' ἰκέτης τε τέτυκται*), and in Od. 22. 74 for *ἀντίσχεσθε* (*hold up against*) *ἀν' ἴσχεσθε* (i. e. *ἄντα ἴσχεσθε*, cp. Od. 1. 334 *ἄντα παρειάδων σχομένη λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα*).

ἀντί also resembles the Improper Prepositions (esp. the Adverbs *ἄντα*, *ἀντίον*, &c.) in being used with the Gen., but not with the Dat. or Acc. It means *in place of*, hence *in the character of*, *equivalent to*: as Il. 21. 75 *ἀντὶ τοῖ ἐμ' ἰκέταο*.

Double Prepositions.

227.] It is characteristic of Homer to form a species of compound by combining two Prepositions. We have—

ἀμφὶ περί, like our *round about*: also *περί τ' ἀμφὶ τε* *round and about*: used adverbially, as Il. 22. 10 *ἄχθαι δ' ἀμφὶ περί μεγάλ' ἱαχον*; in Composition, *ἀμφιπεριστρώφα* (Il. 8. 348), &c.

παρὲξ *out besides, out along, out past*: adverbial in Od. 14. 168 *ἄλλα παρὲξ μεμνώμεθα*: with the Acc., *παρὲξ ἅλα* *alongside the sea*, *παρὲξ τὴν νῆσον* *past the island*; *παρὲκ νόον* *beyond* (= *contrary to*) *reason*: with the Gen., *παρὲξ ὁδοῦ* *aside from the way*.

ὑπέξ, with a Gen. *away from under*, as Il. 13. 89 *φεύξεσθαι ὑπὲκ κακοῦ*.

διέξ, with a Gen. *right through*, as *διέκ προθύρου*, *διέκ μεγάροιο*.

ἀποπρό *quite away*, used adverbially and with a Gen.

διαπρό *right through*, adverbially and with a Gen.

περιπρό *round about*; Il. 11. 180 *περιπρό γὰρ ἔγχεϊ θύε*.

In all these instances the meaning and construction are mainly determined by the first of the two Prepositions (so that *e.g.* παρέξ is used nearly as παρά, διέξ and διαπρό as διά, &c.). The second does little more than add some emphasis.

The treble Preposition ὑπεκπρό is found in Composition : ὑπεκπροθέω, ὑπεκπροπέω, &c. The sense is represented by dividing the words ὑπεκ-προθέω, &c.

A curious variety is found in the Compound προ-προκυλινδόμενος *rolling forward before*, where a second πρό is added to give emphasis to the first.

Improper Prepositions.

228.] The term 'Improper Preposition' may be applied to any Adverb used to govern a Case. The following are some of the most important words of the kind :—

Used with a Genitive : ἄγχι *near, close to*, ἐγγύθι, ἐγγύς *near, ἄντα, ἀντίον, &c. facing, πρόσθε(ν) before, πάροιθε(ν) in front of, ὀπισθε(ν) behind, μεσσηγύς between, ἐντός, ἐντοσθε, ἐνδοθεν within, ἔξω out, ἐκτός, ἐκτοθι, ἐκτοσθε(ν) outside, ἐνερθε beneath, ἀνευ, ἀνευθε(ν) apart from, without, ἄτερ without, νόσφι away from, ἐκάς, ἐκάτερθε(ν) apart from, μέσφα until, πέραν beyond, πάλιν back from, ἀντικρύ straight to, ἰθὺς straight towards, τήλε, τηλόθι far off, ὑπαιθα under, εἵνεκα (ἐνεκα) on account of, ἐκῆτι by the favour of. The Gen. with some of these words may be ablative (§ 152). In general, however, it appears to be used with little or no reference to the meaning of the governing Adverb, and merely in order to connect the two words. Hence these constructions are best brought under the general rule that a Noun governs the Genitive (§ 147).*

With a Dative : ἅμα *together with*, μίγδα *in company with*, ὁμῶς *in like manner*.

ἀμφί takes a Gen. in the meaning *aside from* (Il. 8. 444., 23. 393, Od. 14. 352). It is also found with the Acc. in the same sense as ἀμφί, in the phrase θεοὶ Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἔδοντες, Il. 14. 274., 15. 225 (see also Il. 11. 634, 748, Od. 6. 266); and once with a Dat., viz. in Il. 5. 723 σιδηρέω ἄξονι ἀμφίς. Also as an Adv. = *around* in Il. 9. 464., 24. 488.

εἴσω generally takes an Accusative, as Ἴλιον εἴσω *to Ilium* : but a Gen. in Od. 8. 290 ὁ δ' εἴσω δώματος ἦει *went inside the house* (not merely *to the house*).

The word ὥς was supposed to govern an Accusative in one place in Homer, viz. Od. 17. 218 ὥς αἰεὶ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει θεὸς ὥς τὸν ὁμοῖον. But the true construction is (as Mr. Ridgeway has pointed out) ὥς—ὥς *as God brings like as he brings like, i.e. deals with a man as he dealt with his like* (see *Journal of Philology*, vol. xvii. p. 113).

Note the frequency of Compounds formed by one of these words following a Preposition : ἐν-αντα, εἰς-αντα, ἀν-αντα, κάτ-αντα, πάρ-αντα, ἐν-αντίον, κατ-εν-

αντίον : ἐμ-προσθεν, προ-πάροιθε, μετ-όπισθεν, ἀπ-άνευθεν, ἀπ-άτερθεν, ἀπό-ροσφι, ὑπ-ένερθε, κατ-αντικρύ. Cp. ἀν-δίχα, δι-αμπέρες, κατ-αντίθι, &c. These are not true Compounds (σύνθετα), but are formed by παράθεσις, or mere juxtaposition : i.e. they do not consist of two members, of which the first is wholly employed in limiting or qualifying the second, but of two adverbial words qualifying the same Verb. Thus they are essentially akin to the combinations formed by a Preposition and its Case : see § 178.

Homeric and Attic uses of Prepositions.

229.] The development of the language between the Homeric and the Attic period is especially shown in the uses of Prepositions. It may be convenient here to bring together some of the chief points.

1. Most of the Prepositions,—but esp. ἀμφί, περί, παρά, ἐπί, ὑπό, προτί, ἐνί—are used in Homer adverbially, i.e. as distinct words. Afterwards they become mere unaccented words or prefixes.

2. A variety of the same process shows itself in the disuse of Tmesis. Besides the Prepositions already mentioned, this applies to μετά, ἀνά, κατά, διά, ἐξ, ἀπό, εἰς.

In these processes of development we have seen that the loss of independent meaning is accompanied by a change (which is in all probability simply a *loss*) of accent.

3. The construction with the Dative (which is mostly locative) is the one in which the Preposition retains most nearly its own ‘adverbial’ meaning—so much so that it is often doubtful whether the Preposition can be said to ‘govern’ the Case at all. Accordingly we find that this construction is comparatively rare in Attic. It is virtually lost (except as a poetical survival) with ἀμφί, περί, μετά, ἀνά, and σύν.

4. On the other hand the Genitive is more frequent in Attic, and not confined (as it generally is in Homer) to uses in which it has either an ablative or a quasi-partitive sense. Thus it is used with ἀμφί, περί, and μετά : also with διά of motion *through*. In such uses as these the Case ceases to have a distinct meaning : it merely serves (as with the Improper Prepositions) to show that the Noun is governed by the Preposition.

5. The development of meaning is chiefly seen in the extension from the literal sense of *place* to various derivative or metaphorical senses. Some of these senses are beginning to be used in the Homeric language : e.g. ἀμφί with the Dat. = *about, concerning* ; περί with the Gen. (probably also the Dat.) in the same meaning ; παρά with the Acc. = *in excess of, in violation of* ; μετά with the Acc. = *after* ; ἐπί with the Acc. = *towards* (a person) ; διά with the Acc. = *owing to* ; ἐξ = *in consequence of*. Others may safely be counted as post-Homeric ; note in particular—

περί with the Acc. = *about, nearly* (of time and number); also = *concerning, in relation to*:

παρά with the Dat. = *in the opinion of*; with the Acc. = *during the continuance of*; also *compared with*:

κατά with the Acc. = *answering to*; also *during the time of*; with the Gen. = *about, against*:

ἐπί with the Dat. = *in the power of*:

with many phrases in which the force of the Preposition is vague, such as δι' ὀργῆς, ἀνὰ κράτος, πρὸς βίαν, ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφανοῦς, &c.

6. There are slight but perceptible differences between the usage of the Iliad and that of the Odyssey (§§ 182, 188, 196, 199, 215). Some uses, again, are peculiar to one or two books of the Iliad, esp. 9, 10, 23, 24: see §§ 199 (4), 220, 223 (*fin.*).

CHAPTER X.

THE VERBAL NOUNS.

Introductory.

230.] The preceding chapters deal with the Simple Sentence: that is to say, the Sentence which consists of a single Verb, and the subordinate or qualifying words (Case-forms, Adverbs, Prepositions) construed with it (§ 131). We have now to consider how this type is enlarged by means of the Verbal Nouns.

The Infinitive and Participle, as has been explained (§ 84), are in fact Nouns: the Infinitive is an abstract Noun denoting the action of the Verb, the Participle a concrete Noun expressing that action as an attribute. They are termed 'Verbal' because they suggest or imply a predication, such as a finite Verb expresses (*e.g.* ἐρχεται ἄγων αὐτοὺς *implies* the assertion ἄγει αὐτοὺς), and because the words which depend upon or qualify them are construed with them as with Verbs (ἄγων αὐτοὺς, not ἄγων αὐτῶν *bringer of them*). Thus they have the character of subordinate Verbs, 'governed' by the finite Verb of the sentence, and serving at the same time as centres of dependent Clauses.

The distinction between Infinitives and other abstract Substantives, and again between Participles and other primitive Adjectives, was probably not always so clearly drawn as it is in Greek. The Infinitives of the oldest Sanscrit hardly form a distinct group of words; they are abstract Nouns of various formation, used in several different Cases, and would hardly have

been classed apart from other Case-forms if they had not been recognised as the precursors of the later more developed Infinitive. The Participles, too, are variously formed in Sanscrit, and moreover they are not the only Nouns with which the construction is 'adverbial' instead of being 'adnominal.'

The peculiarity of the Verbal Nouns in point of meaning may be said to consist in the *temporary* and *accidental* character of the actions or attributes which they express. Thus πράττειν and πράξαι suggest a *particular* doing, momentary or progressive, at or during a time fixed by the context; whereas πράξις means *doing*, irrespective of time; πράκτωρ *one who does*, generally or permanently, a *doer*; and so in other cases. The distinction is especially important for Homer. In the later language there are uses of the Infinitive and Participle in which they lose the Verbal element, and have the character of ordinary Nouns; e. g. τὸ πράττειν is nearly equivalent to πράξις, οἱ πράττοντες to πράκτορες, &c.

The Infinitive.

231.] **Form and original meaning.** The Greek Infinitive is a Case-form—usually the Dative—of an abstract Verbal Noun (*nomen actionis*). As a Dative it expresses an action *to* which that of the governing Verb is *directed*, or *for* which it takes place,—viz. a purpose, effect, bearing, &c. of the main action. Thus δόμεν-αι *to give*, being the Dative of a Stem δο-μεν *giving*, means 'to or for giving,' hence *in order to give, so as to give*, &c. But owing to the loss of all other uses of the Dative in Greek (§ 143), and the consequent isolation of the Infinitive, its meaning has been somewhat extended. For the same reason the Infinitives derived from other Cases (§ 85) are no longer used with different meaning, but are retained merely as alternative forms.

The Dative meaning evidently accounts for the common constructions of the Infinitive with Verbs expressing *wish, command, power, expectation, beginning*, and the like: as ἐθέλω δόμεναι lit. *I am willing for giving*, δύναμαι ἰδέειν *I have power for seeing*, &c. In Homer it may be said to be the usual meaning of the Infinitive. It is found in a great many simple phrases, such as ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι *urged together to fight (so that they fought)*, δὸς ἀγειν *give for leading away (to be led away)*, οἶδε νοῆσαι *knows (has sense) to perceive*, βῆ δ' ἰέναι *stepped to go (=took his way, cp. γούνατ' ἐνώμα φευγέμεναι)*; προέηκε πυθέσθαι, πέμπε νέεσθαι, ὤρτο πέτεσθαι, &c. Cp. also—

- II. 1. 22 ἐπενφήμεσαν Ἀχαιοί, αἰδεῖσθαι κτλ. *the Greeks uttered approving cries for (to the effect of) respecting, &c.*; so 2. 290 ὀδύρονται οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι.
2. 107 Ἀγαμέμνονι λείπε φορῆναι, πολλήσιν νήσοισι καὶ Ἀργεῖ παντὶ ἀνάσσειν *left (the sceptre) to Agamemnon to bear, therewith to rule over many islands and Argos.*

Od. 4. 634 ἐμὲ δὲ χρεὼ γίνεται αὐτῆς Ἥλιδ' ἐς εὐρύχορον διαβή-
μεναι *I have need of it for crossing over to Elis.*

The notion of *purpose* often passes into that of adaptation, possibility, necessity, &c.; *e.g.*—

Il. 6. 227 πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἐμοὶ Τρῶες . . κτείνειν *there are many Trojans for me to kill (whom I may kill)*; cp. 9. 688 εἰσὶ καὶ οἷδε τὰδ' εἰπέμεν *these too are here to tell this*, II. 342 ἐγγὺς ἔσαν προφυγῆν *were near for escaping, to escape with.*

13. 98 εἵδεται ἡμᾶρ ὑπὸ Τρώεσσι δαμῆναι *the day is come for being subdued (when we must be subdued) by the Trojans*; cp. Od. 2. 284.

Again, from the notion of direction or effect the Infinitive shades off into that of *reference*, sphere of action, &c.; as Il. 5. 601 οἶον δὴ θαυμάζομεν Ἑκτορα δῖον αἰχμητὴν τ' ἔμειναι κτλ. *for being a warrior*; Od. 7. 148 θεοὶ ὄλβια δοῖεν ζώεμεναι *may the gods grant blessings for living, i.e. in life*; ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι *was best for (and so in) fighting*, εὐχεται εἶναι *boasts for (of) being.*

In the passages quoted the Infinitive is so far an *abstract Noun* that the action which it denotes is not predicated of an *agent*. The agent, if there is one in the speaker's mind, is not given by the form of the sentence; *e.g.* ἐγγὺς ἔσαν προφυγῆν (*were near for escaping*) might mean *were near so as to escape* or (as the context of Il. 11. 342 requires) *were near so that he could escape*; δύναι ἐπειγόμενος would usually mean *eager to set*, but in Od. 13. 30 it means *eager for (the sun's) setting*. Hence the apparently harsh change of subject in such a case as—

Od. 2. 226 καὶ οἱ ἰὼν ἐν νηυσὶν ἐπέτρεπεν οἶκον ἅπαντα πείθεσθαι τε γέροντι καὶ ἔμπεδα πάντα φυλάσσειν *to the intent that it should obey the old man and he should guard all surely (lit. for obeying—for guarding).* And so in Il. 9. 230 ἐν δοιῇ δὲ σωσέμεν ἢ ἀπολέσθαι νῆας, where νῆας is first Object, then Subject. The harshness disappears when we understand that the abstract use is the prevailing one in Homer.

It may also be noticed here that—

(1) With Verbs of privative meaning, the Infinitive may be used as with the corresponding affirmative words: as ἐπριγ' ἀντιβόλῃσιν *shudders as to (from) meeting*; Od. 9. 468 ἀνὰ δ' ὀφρύσιν νεύον ἐκάστω κλαίειν *I nodded backwards to each for weeping (=for-bidding him to weep)*, Il. 22. 474 εἶχον ἀπολέσθαι. But the proper use also appears, as in Il. 22. 5 αὐτοῦ μέναι ἐπέδησε *fettered so that he remained*. Here the context must determine the meaning.

(2) With φρονέω, οἶω, &c. the Infinitive may express the effect or conclusion: *I think to the effect—, hence I think fit*; as Il. 13. 263 οὐ γὰρ ὅτω . . πολέμειζεν *I have no mind to &c.* So

εἰπεῖν *to speak to the intent that, to bid*, as Od. 3. 427 εἶπατε δ' εἴσω δμῶησιν . . πένεσθαι. Other examples are given in § 238.

In this use, as was observed by Mr. Riddell (*Dig.* § 83), the 'dictative force'—the notion of thinking right, advising, &c.—comes through the Infinitive to the governing Verb, not vice versa. The same remark holds of the use with ἔστι *it is possible*, lit. *it is* (a case) *for* (something to happen).

232.] Infinitive with Nouns, &c. It will be useful to bring together instances in which the Infinitive depends upon some qualifying word—Preposition, Adverb, Adjective, &c.—construed with the Verb :—

Il. 1. 258 οἱ περὶ μὲν βουλὴν Δαναῶν περὶ δ' ἔστέ μάχεσθαι *excel them in fighting*.

1. 589 ἀργαλέος γὰρ Ὀλύμπιος ἀντιφέρεσθαι *the Olympian is hard to set oneself against*; cp. 20. 131.

4. 510 ἐπεὶ οὐ σφί λίθος χρῶς οὐδὲ σίδηρος χαλκὸν ἀνασχεσθαι *since their flesh is not stone or iron for withstanding (so as to be able to withstand) bronze*.

8. 223 ἥ ῥ' ἐν μεσσάτῳ ἔσκε γεγωνέμεν ἀμφοτέρωσσε *for shouting (=so that one could shout) both ways*.

13. 775 ἐπεὶ τοι θυμὸς ἀναίτιον αἰτιάσθαι *since your mind is for blaming (is such that you must blame) the innocent*.

Od. 17. 20 οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ σταθμοῖσι μένειν ἔτι τηλίκος εἰμὶ *I am not yet of the age to remain*.

17. 347 αἰδῶς δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κεχρημένῳ ἀνδρὶ παρῆναι *shame is not good to be beside a needy man (is not a good 'backer' for)*.

21. 195 ποῖός κ' εἴτ' Ὀδυσῆϊ ἀμυνέμεν εἴ ποθεν ἔλθοι; = *how would you behave in regard to fighting for Ulysses?*

Od. 2. 60 ἡμεῖς δ' οὐ νό τι τοιοῖ ἀμυνέμεν may be either *we are not like him, so as to defend*, or simply *we are not fit to defend*. The construction of the Inf. is the same in either case: the difference is whether τοιοῖ means 'of the kind' with reference to οἷος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔσκε or to the Inf. ἀμυνέμεν. The latter may be defended by Od. 17. 20 (quoted above).

This construction is extended to some Nouns even when they are not used as predicates; as *θελεῖν ταχύς swift to run*, *θαῦμα ιδέσθαι a wonder to behold* (cp. the use of the Accusative with Adjectives, § 131 *fin.*).

233.] Impersonal Verbs. The Infinitive is used with ἔστι *there is* (means, room, occasion, &c.), *ἔοικε it is fit*, *πέπρωται it is determined*, *εἵμαρτο it was fated*. For ἔστι cp.—

Il. 14. 313 κείσε μὲν ἔστι καὶ ὕστερον ὀρμηθῆναι.

Od. 15. 392 αἶδε δὲ νύκτες ἀθέσφατοι· ἔστι μὲν εὔδειν, ἔστι δὲ τερπομένοισιν ἀκούειν *there is (enough) for sleeping and for listening*.

It is very common with a negative: οὐκ ἔστι, οὐ πως ἔστι, &c. meaning *there is no way, it may not be that, &c.*

The Impersonal use is also found in phrases of the two kinds noticed in § 162, 4; viz.—

(a) With a Neuter Adjective; as ἀργαλέον δέ μοί ἐστι θέσθαι κτλ. *it is difficult for me to make &c.*; μόριμον δέ οἱ ἐστ' ἀλέασθαι *it is fated for him to escape*; so with αἰσχρόν, νεμεσσητόν, αἰσιμον, ἄρκιον, βέλτερον, and the like.

(b) With an abstract Noun: as—

II. 14. 80 οὐ γάρ τις νέμεσις φυγέειν κακόν *there is no wrong in escaping ill.*

Od. 5. 345 ὅθι τοι μοῖρ' ἐστὶν ἀλύξαι *where it is thy fate to &c.*

II. 330 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥρῃ εὖδειν *there is a time for &c.*

So with αἶσα, μόρος, θέμις, χρεώ, ἀνάγκη, αἰδώς, δέος, ἐλπωρή, &c. followed by an Infinitive to express what the *fate, need, shame, &c.* brings about, or in what it consists.

These examples throw light on two much-debated passages:

II. 2. 291 ἦ μὴν καὶ πόνος ἐστὶν ἀνιθθέντα νέεσθαι

verily there is toil for a man to return in vexation, i. e. 'I admit that the toil is enough to provoke any one to return.' Thus understood, the expression is a slightly bold use of the form of sentence that we have in ὥρῃ ἐστὶν εὖδειν, μοῖρα ἐστὶν ἀλύξαι, θυμός ἐστιν ἀνάλτιον αἰτιάσθαι, &c. The other interpretation, 'it is toil to return vexed,' though apparently easier, is not really more Homeric; and it certainly does not fit the context so well.

II. 7. 238 οἶδ' ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ, οἶδ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ νωμῆσαι βῶν
ἀζαλήν, τό μοι ἔστι ταλαύρινον πολέμίζειν

I know how to turn my shield of seasoned ox-hide to the right and to the left, wherefore I have that wherewith to war in stout-shielded fashion (= I have a good claim to the title of ταλαύρινος πολέμιστής, elsewhere an epithet of Ares). Here ἔστι is used as in ἔστιν εὖδειν, &c.

In II. 13. 99-101 ἦ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν δρῶμαι; Τρῶας ἐφ' ἡμετέρας ἰέναι νέας the Inf. follows θαῦμα, or rather the whole phrase θαῦμα τόδε δρῶμαι (= θαῦμά ἐστι): δρῶ does not take an Inf. (§ 245).

234.] Infinitive as apparent Subject, &c. In the Impersonal uses the Infinitive appears to stand as Subject to the Verb; ἀργαλέον ἐστὶ θέσθαι = *making is hard*; οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακὸν βασιλευμένον *to be a king is not a bad thing*. This construction however is not consistent with the original character of the Infinitive. It is plain that ἔστιν εὖδειν can never have meant 'sleeping is,' but 'there is (room &c.) for sleeping': and so ἀργαλέον ἐστὶ θέσθαι is originally, and in Homer, *it (the case, state of things, &c.) is hard in view of making*. It is only in later Greek that we have the form ἀργαλέον ἐστὶ τὸ θέσθαι, in which θέσθαι is an indeclinable Neuter Noun.

The process by which the Infinitive, from being a mere word

of *limitation*, comes to be in sense the Subject or Object of the principal Clause, can be traced in sentences of various forms:—

(1) With a personal Subject; *e.g.* in—

Il. 5. 750 τῆς ἐπιτέτραπται μέγας οὐρανὸς Οὐλυμπὸς τε
ἡμὲν ἀνακλῖναι πυκινὸν νέφος ἥδ' ἐπιθεῖναι

the meaning 'to them is entrusted the opening and shutting of the thick cloud of heaven,' is expressed by saying 'to them heaven is entrusted for opening and shutting the cloud.' So—

Il. 1. 107 αἰεὶ τοι τὰ κάκ' ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσὶ μαντεύεσθαι.

4. 345 ἔνθα φίλ' ὀπταλέα κρέα ἔδμεναι.

Meaning *you love to prophesy evils (to eat roast flesh, &c.)*.

(2) The Impersonal form (ἀργαλέον ἐστὶ) only differs from the other in the vagueness of the Subject, which makes it easier for the Infinitive to become the Subject in sense, while it is still grammatically a word limiting the vague unexpressed Subject.

The use of a Neuter Pronoun as Subject (*e.g.* τό γε καλὸν ἀκούμεν *the thing is good, to listen*) may be regarded as a link between the personal and impersonal forms of expression: cp. § 161 (*note*), also § 258.

(3) Similarly an Infinitive following the *Object* of a Verb may become the logical *Object*; as—

Il. 4. 247 ἢ μένετε Τρῶας σχεδὸν ἐλθέμεν; *do ye wait for the Trojans for their coming on? i.e. for the coming on of the Trojans.*

14. 342 Ἥρη, μήτε θεῶν τό γε δεῖδιθι μήτε τιν' ἀνδρῶν ὄψεσθαι
do not fear any one of gods or of men for their being about to see, i.e. that any one will see: cp. Od. 22. 39, 40.

A further development of this use leads, as we shall see, to the 'Accusative with the Infinitive.'

(4) Again, the Infinitive sometimes takes the place of a vague *unexpressed Object*. Thus οἶδε νοῆσαι means *knows (enough) to perceive*: the full construction being such as we have in Il. 2. 213 ὅς ῥ' ἔπεα φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἄκοσμά τε πολλὰ τε ἦδει . . ἐριζέμεναι *who knew (had a store of) words wherewith to wrangle*. So too δίδωμι with an Infinitive is originally construed as Od. 8. 44 τῷ γάρ ῥα θεὸς πέρι δῶκεν ἀοιδὴν τέρπειν: Il. 11. 20 τὸν ποτὲ οἱ Κινῶρης δῶκε ξεινήϊον εἶναι; thence it comes to mean 'to give (such a state of things) that some event shall happen,' *i.e. to grant the happening*; as δὸς τίσασθαι *grant that I may punish*. In such a passage as Il. 3. 322 τὸν δὸς ἀποφθίμενον δῦναι κτλ. we may take τὸν with δός or as an Acc. with the Inf. δύναι.

A Neuter Pronoun, too, may serve as a vague *Object*, explained by an Infinitive; *e.g.* Il. 5. 665–6 τὸ μὲν οὐ τις ἐπεφράσατ' . . ἐξερύσαι: cp. Od. 21. 278 καὶ τοῦτο ἔπος κατὰ μοῖραν ξείπε, νῦν μὲν παῦσαι τόξον κτλ.

(5) The Infinitive may also be equivalent in sense to the Genitive depending on a Noun; as—

Π. 7. 409 οὐ γὰρ τις φειδῶ νεκρῶν κατατεθνηῶτων
γίγνεται ἐπὶ κε θάνασι πυρὸς μελίσσόμεν ὧκα
i. e. there is no grudging about the appeasing of the dead.
Hence is developed an idiomatic use of the Genitive parallel to
that of the *Accusativus de quo*: see Shilleto on Thuc. 1. 61, 1.

235.] **With Relatives.** It is remarkable that the use of the Infinitive with ὥς, ὥς τε, οἷος, ὅσος, &c. is rare in Homer. The familiar construction of ὥς τε only occurs twice: Π. 9. 42 ἐπέσονται ὥς τε νέεσθαι *is eager to return*, and Od. 17. 20 οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ σταθμοῖσι μένειν ἔτι τηλίκος εἰμὶ, ὥς τ' ἐπιτεилаμένῳ . . πιθέσθαι. The other instances are: Od. 21. 173 τοῖον—οἷόν τε ἔμεναι *such a one as to be*; Od. 5. 484 ὅσσον τε . . ἔρυσθαι *so far as to shelter*; Od. 19. 160 ἀνὴρ οἷός τε μάλιστα οἴκου κήδεσθαι, 21. 117 οἷός τ' . . ἀνελέσθαι.

236.] **With πρὶν and πάρος.** This use is common in Homer: as Π. 1. 98 πρὶν γ' ἀπὸ πατρὶ φίλῳ δόμεναι *before they give back to her father*; 11. 573 πάρος χροά λευκὸν ἐπαυρεῖν *before touching the white flesh*.

The tense is nearly always the Aorist: the exceptions are, Od. 19. 475 πρὶν ἀμφαφάσθαι (a verb which has no Aorist), and Π. 18. 245 πάρος δόρποιο μέδεσθαι. Perhaps however μέδεσθαι is an Aorist: see § 31, 2.

πρὶν with the Indicative first appears in H. Apoll. 357 πρὶν γέ οἱ λὼν ἐφῆκεν. For the use with the Subj. see § 297.

The origin of this singularly isolated construction must evidently be sought in the period when the Infinitive was an abstract Noun; so that (e. g.) πρὶν δόμεναι meant *before the giving*. The difficulty is that a word like πρὶν would be construed with the Ablative, not the Dative: as in fact we find Ablatives used as Infinitives in Sanscrit with *purá* 'before' (Whitney, § 983). It may be conjectured that the Dative Infinitive in Greek was substituted in this construction for an Ablative. Such a substitution might take place when the character of the Infinitive as a Case-form had become obscured.

It is held by Sturm (*Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Constructionen mit πρὶν*, p. 15) that the Inf. has the force of *limitation*: e. g. πρὶν οὐράσθαι 'before in respect to wounding,' before the time of wounding. But on this view the sense would rather be 'too soon to wound.' It is better to say, with Mr. Goodwin (§ 623), that πρὶν is 'quasi-prepositional': and if so the Infinitive had ceased to be felt as a Dative when the use arose.

The restriction to the Aor. Inf. may date from the time when Infinitives—or Case-forms on the way to become Infinitives (§ 242)—were chiefly formed from the same Stem as the Aorist. Cp. the Aor. Participles which are without Tense-meaning (§ 243, 1).

237.] **Accusative with the Infinitive.** Along with the use of the Infinitive as an abstract Noun, we find in Homer the

later use by which it is in sense the Verb of a dependent Clause, the Subject of the Clause being in the Accusative.

In the examples of the Acc. with the Infinitive we may distinguish the following varieties or stages of the idiom:—

1. The Acc. has a grammatical construction with the governing Verb: *e.g.*—

II. 1. 313 λαοὺς δ' Ἀτρεΐδης ἀπολυμαίνεσθαι ἄνωγε *Agamemnon ordered the people to purify themselves* (=that they should purify).

5. 601 οἶον δὴ θαυμάζομεν Ἑκτορα δῖον αἰχμητὴν τ' ἔμμεναι κτλ.
(*for being a warrior, how he was a warrior*).

This might be called the *natural* Acc. with the Infinitive.

2. The Acc. has not a sufficient construction with the Verb alone, but may be used if it is accompanied by an Infinitive of the *thing* or *fact*: *e.g.*—

βούλομ' ἐγὼ λαὸν σῶν ἔμμεναι *I wish the people to be safe* (the safety of the people).

οὐνεκ' ἄκουσε τεῖρεσθαι Τρῶας *because he heard of the Trojans being hard pressed*.

τῷ οὐ νεμεσίζομ' Ἀχαιοὺς ἀσχαλάαν *wherefore I do not think it a shame in the Greeks to chafe*.

In this construction the logical Object is the fact or action given by the Infinitive, to which the Acc. furnishes a Subject or *agent*, and thus turns it from an abstract Noun to a predication (so that *e.g.* τεῖρεσθαι Τρῶας is virtually = ὅτι ἐτείροντο Τρῶες). It is found with Verbs that usually take only a 'Cognate Acc.' (Neuter Pronoun, &c.), as φημί, εἶπον, ἀκούω, πυνθάνομαι, οἶδα, οἶω, φρονέω, ἐθέλω, βούλομαι, ἔλπομαι, νεμεσίζομαι, φθονέω, &c. Thus it is in principle a particular form of the *Accusativus de quo* (see § 140, 3, *b*, also § 234, 3).

3. The Acc. has no construction except as the Subject of the Infinitive. This Acc. is chiefly found in Homer—

(a) after Impersonal Verbs (§ 162, 4): as—

II. 18. 329 ἀμφω γὰρ πέπρωται ὁμοίην γαίαν ἐρεῦσαι
it is fated for both to &c.

19. 182 οὐ μὲν γάρ τι νεμεσσητὸν βασιλῆα ἄνδρ' ἀπαρέσσεσθαι
it is no shame that a king should &c.

(b) after πρῖν and πάρος; as πρῖν ἐλθεῖν νῆας Ἀχαιῶν *before the Greeks came*, πάρος τὰδε ἔργα γενέσθαι *before these things came to pass*.

The other examples are from the *Odyssey*, viz.—

Od. 4. 210 ὥς νῦν Νέστορι δῶκε διαμπερὲς ἥματα πάντα
αὐτὸν μὲν λιπαρῶς γηρασκέμεν (10. 533., 14. 193).

This may be called the purely *idiomatic* Acc. with the Infinitive. It has evidently been formed on the analogy of the older varieties.

238.] Tenses of the Infinitive. So long as the Infinitive is merely a Verbal Noun, it does not express anything about the time of the action as past, present, or future. But when it is virtually a predication, the idea of time comes in; *e.g.*—

Il. 5. 659 ἄλλ' οἷόν τινα φασὶ βίην Ἑρακλεΐην
ἔμμεναι ('what they say he *was*'): cp. Od. 8. 181.

14. 454 οὐ μὰν αὖτ' ὅτω . . ἄλιον πηδῆσαι ἄκουτα,
ἀλλὰ τις Ἀργείων κόμισε χροῖ.

The Future Infinitive is used with φημί, δῖω, ἔλπομαι, ὑπισχνέομαι, ὁμνυμι and other Verbs implying *expectation* or *promise*; also with μέλλω when it means *to be about to*.

When the Inf. expresses, not simple expectation as to the future, but *fitness, obligation, necessity*, or the like (§ 231, 2), the Aorist or Present is used. Thus Il. 13. 262 οὐ γὰρ δῖω πολεμίζειν means, not 'I do not think I shall fight,' but *I do not think fit, I have no mind, to fight*; so Il. 3. 98 φρονέω διακρινθήμεναι *my mind is* (=δοκεῖ μοι) *that they should be parted*: 9. 608 φρονέω τετιμῆσθαι *I claim to be honoured*: 22. 235 νοέω φρεσὶ τιμῆσθαι *I see (understand) that I should honour thee* (=I purpose to honour thee): 24. 560 νοέω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς Ἑκτορά τοι λῦσαι: and so in a prophecy, Od. 2. 171 φημι τελευτηθῆναι ἅπαντα *I say that all must be accomplished*: and—

Il. 13. 665 ὅς ρ' εὖ εἰδὼς κῆρ' ὀλοὴν ἐπὶ νηὸς ἔβαινε,
πολλάκι γάρ οἱ ἔειπε γέρων ἀγαθὸς Πολύτιδος
νόσφ' ὑπ' ἀργαλή φθίσθαι οἷς ἐν μεγάροισιν
that he must perish (according to his fate).

So with μοῖρα and θέσφατόν ἐστι: also with μέλλω when it means *to be likely*: Il. 11. 364 ᾧ μέλλεις εὐχεσθαι *to whom it is like that you pray*; Od. 9. 475 οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες ἀνάλκιδος ἀνδρὸς ἐταίρους ἔδμεναι *he proves to be no helpless man whose comrades you ate*; Il. 21. 83 μέλλω πον ἀπέχθεσθαι *it must be that I am become hateful*; Il. 18. 362 μέλλει βροτὸς τελέσσαι *a man is likely to accomplish* (*i.e.* it may be expected of him).

The instances in which a Pres. or Aor. Inf. appears to be used of future time may be variously accounted for. The Inf. ἵεναι has a future sense in Il. 17. 709 οὐδέ μιν οἶω νῦν ἵεναι κτλ.; so Il. 20. 365., Od. 15. 214. Again in Od. 9. 496 καὶ δὴ φάμεν αὐτόθ' ὀλέσθαι the Aor. is used for the sake of vividness—we thought 'we are lost': cp. Il. 9. 413 ὦλετο μὲν μοι νόστος (§ 78). Similarly Il. 3. 112 ἐλπόμενοι παύσασθαι may be *hoping that they had ceased* (by the fact of the proposed duel); cp. Il. 7. 199., 16.

281. So Od. 13. 173 *ὃς ἔφασκε Ποσειδάων' ἀγάσασθαι* *who said that Poseidon was moved to indignation* (= *ὄτι ἠγάσσατο*).

In several places the reading is uncertain, the Fut. being of the same metrical value as the Aor. or the Pres. (-εσθαι and -ασθαι, -ιζειν and -ιζειν, &c.). In such cases the evidence of the ancient grammarians and the MSS. is usually indecisive, and we are justified in writing the Fut. throughout, according to the general rule. Thus—

II. 3. 28 *φάτο γὰρ τίσεσθαι* (so Ven. A.: most MSS. *τίσασθαι*). Hence we may read *φάτο γὰρ τίσεσθαι* in Od. 20. 121.

22. 118 (*ἀλλ' ἀποδάσσεσθαι* (so Aristarchus: most MSS. -ασθαι).

22. 120 *μή τι κατακρύψειν, ἀλλ' ἀνδιχα πάντα δάσσεσθαι* (MSS. -ασθαι).

23. 773 *ἐμελλον ἐπαίξεσθαι* (the best MSS. have -ασθαι).

20. 85 (*ὑπίασχεο*) *ἐναντίβιον πολεμίζειν* (so A. D.: other MSS. *πολεμίζειν*).

16. 830 *ἧ που ἔφησθα πόλιν κεραϊζέμεν* (MSS. -ιζέμεν).

Od. 2. 373 *ὅμοσον μὴ . . τάδε μυθήσεσθαι* (so Ar.: MSS. -ασθαι).

Two exceptions remain: Od. 2. 280 *ἐλπαρή τοι ἔπειτα τελευτῆσαι τάδε ἔργα* (τελευτῆσειν in one of Ludwich's MSS.): II. 12. 407 *ἐπεὶ οἱ θυμὸς ἐέλπετο κῶδος ἀρέσθαι* (some good authorities give *ἐέλδετο*).*

The only example of an Inf. representing an Optative is—

II. 9. 684 *καὶ δ' ἂν τοῖς ἄλλοισιν ἔφη παραμυθήσασθαι*

which is the report of the speech (v. 417) *καὶ δ' ἂν . . παραμυθησαίμην*. But cp. Od. 3. 125 *οὐδέ κε φαίης . . μυθήσασθαι γοῦ* *would not think that . . would speak*.

239.] Dative with the Infinitive. An idiomatic use of the Dative arises when the Noun which stands as logical subject to an Inf. of *purpose* is put in the same Case with it, *i. e.* in the Dative. Thus the construction in—

αἰσχρὸν γὰρ τὸδε γ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι

is idiomatic (as compared with *σφῶν δὸς ἄγειν*, &c.), because the meaning is, not 'is shameful for future men,' but 'is shameful for (with a view to) the hearing of future men.' The principle is evidently the same as has been pointed out in the case of the Nominative and the Accusative (§ 234). Because the *action* of the Infinitive stands in a Dative relation to the governing Verb, the *agent* or Subject of the action is put in the Dative.

This construction is found in the 'double Dative' of Latin (*e. g.* *ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι* would be in Latin *posteris auditui*), and of Sanscrit (Delbrück, *A. S.* p. 149). It is usually classified as 'Attraction'—the Dat. of the *person* being regarded as following the Dat. of the *thing* or action. In Greek it evidently goes back to the time when the Inf. was still felt as a Dative.

240.] Predicative Nouns—'Attraction.' Corresponding to the Nominative in the Predicate (§ 162), an Infinitival Clause

* See Madvig, *Bemerkungen über einige Punkte der griech. Wortfügungslehre*, p. 34: Cobet, *Misc. Crit.* p. 328.

may have a Predicative *Accusative*, in agreement with its (expressed or understood) Subject: as Π. 4. 341 σφῶν μὲν τ' ἐπέοικε μετὰ πρῶτοιςιν ἔοντας ἑστάμεν *it becomes you that you should stand among the foremost*; Π. 8. 192 τῆς νῦν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει πᾶσαν χρυσεῖην ἔμεναι *whose fame reaches heaven that it is all gold*.

Or the words which enter in this way into an Infinitival Clause may follow the construction of the principal Clause, and thus be put in the Nom. or Dat.; as—

- Π. 1. 76 καὶ μοι ὁμοσσον, ἡ μὲν μοι πρόφρων . . ἀρήξειν
12. 337 οὐ πῶς οἱ ἔην βῶσαντι γεγωνεῖν.

Here *πρόφρων* is said to be 'attracted' into the Nom. (agreeing with the subject of *ὁμοσσον*), and *βῶσαντι* into the Dat. (agreeing with *οἱ*).

The difference of meaning given by the two constructions is generally to be observed in Homer, at least in the case of the Dative. A Noun or Participle is put in the Acc. if it is closely connected with the Inf., so as to become an essential *part* of the predication: whereas a Dat. construed with the principal Clause expresses something *prior* to the Inf. (either a *condition* or a *reason*). Thus—

- Π. 1. 541 αἰεὶ τοι φίλον ἔστιν ἐμεῦ ἀπὸ νόσφιν ἔοντα
κρυπτάδια φρονέοντα δικαζέμεν,

means 'you like to decide apart from me,' *i.e.* 'you like, when you decide, to be apart from me': whereas with *ἔοντι* the sense would be 'when you are apart from me you like to decide.' So Π. 15. 57 εἴπησι Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι πανσάμενον πολέμοιο ἱκέσθαι 'shall bid Poseidon to cease from war and come'—not 'when he has ceased, to come.'

But with a Dat.—

Π. 6. 410 ἐμοὶ δέ κε κέρδιον εἴη σεῦ ἀφαρμούσῃ χθόνα δῦμεναι *it were better for me, if (or when) I lose thee, to &c.*

Π. 8. 218 εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκ' Ἀγαμέμνονι πότνια Ἥρῃ
αὐτῷ ποιπνύσαντι θοῶς δτρύναι Ἀχαιοὺς
'who had of himself made hot haste,' αὐτῷ as in the phrase μεμαῶτε καὶ αὐτῷ (13. 46., 15. 604).*

- Π. 15. 496 οὐ οἱ ἀεικὲς ἀμνημονέω περὶ πάτρης τεθνάμεν
to die when fighting for his country.

So Π. 5. 253., 13. 96., 20. 356., 21. 185., 22. 72.

There are some exceptions, however, if our texts are to be trusted; *i.e.* there are places where a word which belongs to the predication is put in the Dat. owing to a preceding Dat.: *e.g.*—

- Π. 15. 117 εἰ πέρ μοι καὶ μοῖρα Διὸς πληγέντι κεραυνῷ
κείσθαι ὁμοῦ νεκέεσσι (cp. Od. 19. 139, 284).

* This is pointed out by Dingeldein, *De participio Homericō*, p. 8.

This seems to be always the case when there are two successive Participles, the first of which is properly in the Dat. : as—

Π. 12. 410 ἀργαλέον δέ μοί ἐστι καὶ ἰφθίμῳ περ ἐόντι
μοῦνῳ ῥηξάμενῳ θέσθαι παρὰ νηυσὶ κέλευθον.

Here the meaning is, 'to break through and make' &c.,—and therefore ῥηξάμενον would be correct; but after ἐόντι the change from the Dat. to the Acc. would be very harsh. So Π. 13. 317–319, Od. 10. 494–5. In other places the text may be at fault. As attraction became the rule in later Greek, and the two Case-forms are generally of the same metrical form, it would be easy for a Dat. to take the place of an Acc. : e.g. in Π. 9. 398–400 ἔνθα δέ μοι . . ἐπέσσυτο θυμὸς ἀγῆνωρ γήμαντι . . κτήμασι τέρπεσθαι, where for γήμαντι, the reading of Aristarchus, others gave γήμαντα, which conforms to the principle laid down.

When the Subject of the Infinitive is also Subject of the governing Verb the Nominative is generally used : as Π. 1. 76 (quoted above), 1. 415., 4. 101–3., 8. 498, &c. An exception is—

Od. 9. 224 ἐνθ' ἐμὲ μὲν πρότιςθ' ἔταροι λίσσοντ' ἐπέεσσι,
τυρῶν αἰνυμένους ἰέναι πάλιν

that they might take of the cheques and so go back.

241.] Infinitive as an Imperative. This use is often found in Homer, but chiefly after an Imperative, so that the Infinitive serves to carry on the command already given :—

Π. 1. 322 ἔρχεσθον κλισίην Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεΐδαο,
χειρὸς ἐλόντ' ἀγέμεν Βρισηΐδα.

2. 8–10 βάσκ' ἴθι . . ἀγορευόμεν ὥς ἐπιτέλλω.

3. 459 ἔκδοτε, καὶ τιμὴν ἀποτινέμεν.

Od. 4. 415 καὶ τότ' ἔπειθ' ὑμῖν μελέτω κάρτος τε βίη τε,
αἰδοί δ' ἔχειν κτλ. (cp. v. 419, 422 ff.).

Or after a Future, to express what the person addressed is to do as *his* part in a set of acts :—

Π. 22. 259 νεκρὸν Ἀχαιοῖσιν δώσω πάλιν, ὥς δὲ σὺ ρέξεις.

Od. 4. 408 εὐνάσω ἐξείης· σὺ δ' ἐν κρίνασθαι ἐταίρους.

So after a clause which leads up to a command; Π. 11. 788 ἀλλ' εὖ οἱ φάσθαι (Achilles is the mightier) *but do you advise him well*: 17. 691., 20. 335. Cp. also, Π. 10. 65 αἰθι μένειν (answer to the question *am I to remain here?*): 5. 124 θαρσέων νῦν . . μάχεσθαι (in answer to a prayer) *without fear now you may fight*.

The use for the Third Person is rare: in a *command*, Π. 6. 86–92 εἰπὲ δ' ἔπειτα μητέρι σῇ καὶ ἐμῇ· ἥ δὲ . . θεῖναι κτλ.; 7. 79 σῶμα δὲ οἱκαδ' ἐμὸν δόμεναι πάλιν (let him take my arms) *but give back my body*; so 17. 155., 23. 247, Od. 11. 443: in a *prayer*, with a Subject in the Accusative,—

II. 2. 412 Ζεῦ κύδιστε, μέγιστε, κελαινεφές, αἰθέρι ναίων,
μὴ πρὶν ἐπ' ἥελιον δῶναι κτλ. (cp. 3. 285., 7. 179).

Od. 17. 354 Ζεῦ ἄνα, Τηλέμαχόν μοι ἐν ἀνδράσιν ὄλβιον εἶναι.

An Infinitive of wish is used with the Subject in the Nom., once of the Second Person, and once of the First Person :—

Od. 7. 311 αἶ γὰρ Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἀπολλων
τοῖος ἔων οἷός ἐσσι, τὰ τε φρονέων ἃ τ' ἐγὼ περ,
παῖδά τ' ἐμὴν ἐχέμεν καὶ ἐμὸς γαμβρὸς καλέεσθαι.

24. 376 αἶ γὰρ . . οἷος Νήρικον εἶλον . . τοῖος ἔων . . ἐφεστά-
μεναι καὶ ἀμύνειν.

The force of the Infinitive in all these uses seems to be that of an *indirect* Imperative. The command is given as something *following* on an expressed or implied state of things. Thus we may connect the idiom with the use of the Infinitive to imply *fitness, obligation, &c.* (§ 231); compare *εἰσι καὶ οἶδε τάδ' εἰπέμεν* *these are here to say this* with *καὶ δὲ σὺ εἰπέμεναι* *it is your part to say*. There is a similar use of the Infinitive in Sanscrit, with ellipse of the verb *to be* (Delbrück, *A. S.* p. 15: Whitney, § 982, *c, d*).

It should be noticed, however, that other languages have developed a use of the Infinitive in commands, to which this explanation does not apply: as Germ. *schrift fahren!* In these cases we may recognise a general tendency towards the impersonal form. It is very probable that the ordinary 2 Sing. Imper. λέγε represents an original use of the Tense-stem without any Person-ending (Paul, *Principien*, p. 108).

242.] Origin and history of the Infinitive. That the Greek Infinitive was originally the Dative of an abstract Noun is proved by comparison with Sanscrit. 'In the Veda and Brāhmaṇa a number of verbal nouns, *nomina actionis*, in various of their cases, are used in constructions which assimilate them to the infinitive of other languages—although, were it not for these other later and more developed and pronounced infinitives, the constructions in question might pass as ordinary case-constructions of a somewhat peculiar kind' (Whitney, § 969). In the Veda these Infinitives, or Case-forms on the way to become Infinitives (*werdende Infinitive*, Delbr.), are mostly Datives, expressing *end* or *purpose*, and several of them are identical in formation with Greek Infinitives; as *dāvane δοῦναι* (*δοῖναι*), *vidmane Ἰδμεναι*, *-dhyai -σθαι*,* *-ase -σαι*. In Greek, however, the Dative Ending *-αι* is not otherwise preserved, and the 'true Dative' construction is not applied to *things* (§ 143): conse-

* So Delbrück and others; but see Max Müller's *Chips*, Vol. IV. p. 58.

quently these forms stand quite apart from the Case-system, and have ceased to be felt as real Case-forms. Thus the Greek Infinitive is a *survival*, both in form and in construction, from a period when the Dative of purpose or consequence was one of the ordinary idioms of the language. In Latin, again, this Dative is common enough, and often answers in meaning to the Greek Infinitive; compare (*e.g.*) ὥη ἐστὶν εἶδew with *munitioni tempus relinquere* (Roby, § 1156), ἀμύνειν εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλοι with *auxilio esse*, &c. The retention of the construction in Latin is connected, on the one hand with the fact that the Latin Dative is a 'true Dative,' on the other hand with the comparatively small use that is made in Latin of the Infinitive of purpose. Similarly in classical Sanscrit the Dative of purpose &c. is extremely common, but the Dative Infinitives have gone entirely out of use (Whitney, § 287 and § 986)—a result of the 'struggle for existence' which precisely reverses the state of things in Greek.

The growth of the Dative of purpose into a distinct subordinate Clause was favoured by the habit of placing it at the end of the sentence, after the Verb, so that it had the appearance of an addition or afterthought. This was the rule in Vedic Sanscrit (see Delbrück, *A. S.* p. 25). It may be traced in Greek, not merely in collocations like ἐριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι, &c., but even in such forms as—

Il. 5. 639 ἄλλ' οἷόν τινα φασι βλῆν 'Ηρακλῆϊν
ἐμμεναι (*what they call him as to being*),

where the Inf. appears to be added epexegetically after a slight pause: cp. Il. 2. 249., 17. 27., 21. 463, 570, Od. 1. 233, 377., 6. 43., 17. 416.

The development of the Infinitival Clause which we find in Greek and Latin may be traced chiefly under two heads; (1) the construction of the 'Accusative with the Infinitive,' by which the predication of the Infinitive was provided with an expressed Subject (§ 237): and (2) the system of Tenses of the Infinitive, which was gradually completed by the creation of new *forms*,—esp. the Future Infinitive, peculiar to Greek,—and by the use of the Present Infinitive as equivalent in meaning to the Present and Imperfect Indicative. In the post-Homeric language the Infinitive came to be used as an equivalent, not only for the Indicative, but also for other Moods.

The use of the Infinitive as an indeclinable Noun is subsequent to Homer; it became possible with the later use of the Article. Some of the conditions, however, out of which it grew may be traced in Homeric language. The first of these was the complete separation of the Infinitive from the Case-system; so that it

ceased to be felt as a Case-form, and could be used in parallel construction to the Nom. or Acc.: as—

II. 2. 453 τοῖσι δ' ἄφαρ πόλεμος γλυκίων γένετ' ἢ νέεσθαι.

7. 203 δὸς νίκην Αἴαντι καὶ ἀγλαὸν εὖχος ἀρέσθαι.

Again, an Infinitive following a Neuter Pronoun, and expressing the logical Subject or Object, easily came to be regarded as in 'Apposition' to the Pronoun: as—

Od. I. 370 ἐπεὶ τό γε καλὸν ἀκούμεν ἐστὶν αἰδοῦ.

II. 358 καὶ κε τὸ βουλοίμην, καὶ κεν πολλὸν κέρδιον εἴη,
πλειότερῃ σὺν χειρὶ φίλῃν ἐς πατρίδ' ἰκέσθαι.

The only instance which really comes near the later 'Articular Infinitive' is Od. 20. 52 ἀνὴρ καὶ τὸ φυλάσσειν (§ 259). The use of the Infinitive with an Article in the Gen. or Dat. is wholly post-Homeric.

The Participle.

243.] Uses of the Participle. Following out the view of the Participle as a Verbal Adjective, we may distinguish the following uses:—

1. The Participle is often used as an ordinary Adjective qualifying a Noun; as θεοὶ αὖν ἔδοντες, βροτοὶ σίτον ἔδοντες, πίθοι ποτὶ τοίχον ἀρηρότες, σάκος τετυγμένον, and the like. In one or two cases it is Substantival: as τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων, ψυχὰς εἰδῶλα καμόντων, Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες.

A few Participles have lost their Verbal character altogether: esp. οὐλόμενος *miserable*, δνήμενος *happy*, ἱκμενος *secundus*, ἄσμενος *glad*, ἐκὼν *willing*, ἔθων (better ἐθών, since it is an Aor. in form, § 31, 1) *according to wont*, περιπλόμενος (in the phrase περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν *the revolving years*); also the Substantival μέδοντες *rulers*, τένοντες *muscles*, ἀμείβοντες *rafters*, αἰθουσα *a portico*, δράκων *a serpent*, γέρων, μούσα. The word κρείων *ruler* retains a trace of the Verb in εὐρὺ κρείων *widely ruling*. Cp. also the compounds πολύ-της, ἀ-κάμας, ἀ-δάμας, λυκά-βας.

2. Much more frequently, the Participle qualifies or forms part of the predication (§ 162): e.g. in such combinations as—

διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε *parted having quarrelled*
εὐφρονέων ἀγορήσατο *spoke with good thought*

the Participle has the same construction as the Adjective in παλιννοστος ἀπέστη, or πρόφρων τέτληκας (§ 162, 2). Thus it serves to express a predication which the speaker wishes to subordinate in some way to that of the governing Verb.

The Participle may express different relations: attendant *cir-*

cumstance or manner (as in the examples quoted); *cause*, as II. 11. 313 τί παθόντε λελάσμεθα θούριδος ἀλκῆς; *opposition*, as often with καί and περ, &c. (Goodwin, §§ 832-846).

3. Finally, a Participle construed in 'Apposition' to a Noun in an oblique Case may imply a predication (§ 168); as καπνὸν ἀποθρῶσκοντα νοῆσαι *to descry the smoke rising* (i. e. *when it rises, or that it rises, &c.*). Note that—

(a) A Participle of this kind often has the character of a distinct Clause, coming at the end of a sentence, and after a metrical pause: as—

II. 4. 420 δεινὸν δ' ἔβραχε χαλκὸς ἐπὶ στήθεσιν ἀνακτος
δρηνύμενον (*as he roused himself*).

Od. 23. 205 ὡς φάτο, τῆς δ' αὐτοῦ λῦτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ
σήματ' ἀναγνώσσης (*when she recognised the token*).

(b) Not unfrequently the word with which the Participle should be construed is understood: especially when it is a Partitive or quasi-Partitive Gen. (§§ 147, 151):—

II. 2. 153 αὐτῇ δ' οὐρανὸν ἵκεν οἶκαδε ἱεμένων *a cry rose to heaven (of men) eager to return home*: so II. 12. 339., 13. 291, 498., 15. 689.

5. 162 πόρτιος ἥ ἐ βοῶς ξύλοχον κάτα βοσκομένων *a heifer or cow (of those) that are feeding in a thicket*.

5. 665 τὸ μὲν οὖ τις ἐπεφράσατ' οὐδ' ἐνόησε μηροῦ ἐξερύσαι
δῶρυ μείλινον, ὅφρ' ἐπιβαίῃ, σπενδόντων *no one . . . (of them) in their haste*: cp. 15. 450 τό οἱ οὖ τις ἐρύκακεν ἱεμένων περ.

18. 246 ὀρθῶν δ' ἑσταότων ἀγορῇ γένετ' *an assembly was held upstanding (of them standing up)*.

Od. 17. 489 Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐν μὲν κραδίη μέγα πένθος ἄεξε
βλημένον (*for his having been wounded*).

So with the Dative; II. 12. 374 ἐπειγομένοισι δ' ἴκοντο *came as a relief (to them) when they were hard pressed*; Od. 5. 152 κατείβετο δὲ γλυκὺς αἰὼν νόστον ὀδυρομένῳ.

(c) The Subject thus understood may be indefinite:—

II. 2. 291 πόνος ἐστὶν ἀνιηθέντα νέεσθαι (see § 233).

6. 267 οὐδέ πη ἔστι κελαϊνεφεΐ Κρονίωνι
αἵματι καὶ λύθρῳ πεπαλαγμένον εὐχετάσθαι
for one who is bespattered . . . to pray.

13. 787 παρ δύναμιν δ' οὐκ ἔστι καὶ ἐσσύμενον πολεμίζειν.

So II. 2. 234., 14. 63, Od. 2. 311: cp. the phrase ὅσον τε γέγωνε βοήσας *as far as a man makes himself heard by shouting*.

(d) The Participle is sometimes found in a different Case from

a preceding Pronoun with which it might have been construed. Thus we have—

Il. 14. 25 λάκε δέ σφι περὶ χροῖ χαλκὸς ἀτείρῃς
νυσοσμένων (construed with χροῖ instead of σφι).

16. 531 ὅττι οἱ ᾧκ' ἤκουσε μέγας θεὸς εὐξαμένοιο
(with ἤκουσε instead of οἱ).

Od. 9. 256 ὧς ἔφαθ', ἡμῖν δ' αὖτε κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ
δαισάντων (so Il. 3. 301, Od. 6. 157., 9. 458).

Il. 20. 413 τὸν βάλε . . . νῶτα παραύσσοντος wounded him . . .
in the back as he darted past.

Od. 4. 646 ἦ σε βεῖν ἀέκοντος ἀπηύρα.

Il. 10. 187 ὧς τῶν νήδυμος ὕπνος ἀπὸ βλεφάρουιν δλώλει
νύκτα φυλασσομένοισι κακῇν : so Il. 14. 141-3.

Od. 17. 555 μεταλλήσαι τί ἐ θυμὸς
ἀμφὶ πόσει κέλεται καὶ κήδεά περ πεπαθνίη.

We need not consider these as instances of 'Anacoluthon' or change of the construction. The Participle, as we saw, does not need a preceding Pronoun : it may therefore have a construction independent of such a Pronoun. And it is characteristic of Homer not to employ concord as a means of connecting distant words when other constructions are admissible.

244.] Tenses of the Participle. The distinction between the Present and Aorist Participle has already been touched upon in §§ 76-77, and the meaning of the Perfect Participle in § 28.

It may be remarked here, as a point of difference between the two kinds of Verbal Noun, that the Aorist Participle almost always represents an action as past at the time given by the Verb (e.g. ὧς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔζετο having thus spoken he sat down), whereas the Aor. Inf. generally conveys no notion of time. This however is not from the Participle itself conveying any notion of past time. Indeed it is worth notice that the Participles which are without Tense-meaning are chiefly Aorists in form (§ 243, 1).

The Future Participle is used predicatively with Verbs of motion : ἦλθε λυσόμενος came to ransom, καλέουσ' ἔε went to call, ἦγ' ἐπικουρήσουντα, ἐπέδραμε τεύχεα συλήσων, &c. The exceptions to this rule are—

(1) ἐσσόμενος future, in Il. 1. 70 τὰ τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα
things future and past ; 2. 119 καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι.

(2) ἐπιβησόμενος, in Il. 5. 46 (16. 343) νύξ' ἵππων ἐπιβησόμενον,
23. 379 αἰεὶ γὰρ δίφρου ἐπιβησομένοισιν ἔϊκτην. But see § 41.

(3) Il. 18. 309 καὶ τε κτανέοντα κατέκτα, see § 43.

(4) Od. 11. 608 αἰεὶ βαλέοντι ἐοικώς like one about to cast.

245.] Implied Predication. Where the Participle is predicative, we often find the Noun or Pronoun taking the place in the construction of the whole Participial Clause : as *Il.* 17. 1 οὐδ' ἔλαθ' Ἀτρεὺς υἱὸν Πάτροκλος Τρώεσσι δαμείν *that Patroclus had fallen* : *Od.* 5. 6 μέλε γάρ οἱ ἔδον ἐν δώμασι νύμφης *it troubled her that he was &c.* : *Il.* 6. 191 γίνωσκε θεοῦ γόνον ἦν ἐόντα *knew him for the offspring of a god* : *Od.* 10. 419 σοὶ μὲν νοστήσαντι ἐχάρημεν *we were gladdened by thy return* : *Il.* 13. 417 ἄχος γένετ' εὐξαμένοιο *there was vexation at his boasting* : *Il.* 5. 682., 14. 504., 17. 538, 564., 18. 337, &c.

We have here the idiom already observed in the use of the Infinitive (§ 237) by which the weight of the meaning is shifted from the grammatical Subject, Object, &c. to a limiting or qualifying word. Note especially that—

1. The Aor. Participle may be used in this way to express a fact which *coincides* in time with the Verb of the sentence : as *Il.* 6. 284 εἰ κείνόν γε ἴδοιμι κατελθόντ' Ἀἴδος εἴσω. So especially when the *time* of the fact is the important point, as *ἔς ἥλιον καταδύντα* *till sun-set* : *Il.* 13. 38 μένοιεν νοστήσαντα ἄνακτα *should await the master's return* : 13. 545 Θόωνα μεταστρεφθέντα δοκέουσας.

2. With Verbs of *saying, hearing, knowing, &c.*, also of *rejoicing* and *grieving*, the Acc. with a Participle is used like the Acc. with the Inf. (both being evidently applications of the *Accusativus de quo*, § 140, 3, b) : *e.g.*—

Il. 7. 129 τοὺς νῦν εἰ πλώσσοντας ὕφ' Ἑκτορι πάντας ἀκούσαι *if he were to hear of their shrinking.*

Od. 4. 732 εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ πυθόμην ταύτην ὁδὸν ὀρμαίνοντα.

23. 2 δεσποίνῃ ἐρέουσα φίλον πόσιν ἐνδὸν ἐόντα.

Il. 1. 124 οὐδέ τί πού ἴδμεν ξυνήϊα κείμενα πολλὰ.

Od. 7. 211 οὓς τινὰς ὑμεῖς ἴστε μάλιστ' ὀχέοντας διζύν.

Il. 8. 378 ἡ νῶϊ . . γηθήσει προφανεῖσα *will rejoice at our appearing.*

13. 353 ἦχθετο γάρ ῥα Τρῶσιν δαμναμένους *he was vexed at their being subdued by the Trojans.*

A further extension, analogous to the Acc. with the Inf. after Impersonal Verbs, may perhaps be seen in *Od.* 6. 193 ὃν ἐπέοιχ' ἐκέτην ταλαπελρίων ἀντιάσαντα *which it is fit that a suppliant should meet with.*

246.] Genitive Absolute. This is a form of implied predication, in which the Noun or Pronoun has no regular construction with the governing Verb. The Participial Clause expresses

the *time* or *circumstances* in which the action of the Verb takes place :—

Π. 1. 88 οὗ τις ἐμὲ ζῶντος κτλ. *no one, while I am living shall &c.*

2. 551 περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν *as years go round.*

5. 203 ἀνδρῶν εἰλομένων *where men are crowded* ; so ἀνδρῶν λικμώντων, ἀνδρῶν τρεσσάντων, πολλῶν ἐλκόντων, &c.

Od. 1. 390 καὶ κεν τοῦτ' ἐθέλωμι Διὸς γε διδόντος ἀρέσθαι *that too I would be willing to obtain if Zeus gave it.*

The Subject is understood in Od. 4. 19 μολπῆς ἐξάρχοντος *when the singer began the music.*

The Aorist Participle is less common in Homer than the Present, especially in the Odyssey : the instances are, Π. 8. 164, 468., 9. 426., 10. 246, 356., 11. 509., 13. 409., 14. 522., 16. 306., 19. 62, 75., 21. 290, 437., 22. 47, 288, 383, Od. 14. 475., 24. 88, 535 (Classen, *Beob.* p. 180 ff.).

The 'Genitive Absolute' must have begun as an extension of one of the ordinary uses of the Gen. ; most probably of the Gen. of *Time* (§ 150). For, ἡελίου ἀνιόντος *within the time of the sun's rising* is a Gen. like ἡοῦς *in the morning*, νυκτός *by night*, &c., and answers, as a phrase denoting time, to ἂμ' ἡέλιω καταδύντι *at sun-set*, ἐς ἡέλιον καταδύντα *up to sun-set*, &c. So we may compare τοῦδ' αὐτοῦ λυκάβαντος ἐλεύσεται *he will come within this year* with ἡ σέθεν ἐνθάδ' ἐόντος ἐλεύσεται *he will come within your being here* ; and again περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν *in the years as they go round*, with τῶν προτέρων ἐτέων *in the former years*. The transition may be seen in ἔαρος νέον ἱσταμένοιο *in the spring when it is beginning*. Compare also the phrases ἐπειγομένων ἀνέμων, Βορέας πεσόντος, &c. with νημελής *in calm weather*, &c.

The circumstance that the Ablative is the 'Absolute' Case in Latin is far from proving that the Greek Gen. in this use is Ablative. In Sanscrit the Case used in this way is the Locative, occasionally the Genitive : and the Latin Abl. Absolute may represent a Locative of *time at which*, or an Instrumental of *circumstance* (§ 144). The hypothesis that such Participial Clauses in Greek expressed *space of time within which* (rather than *point of time*, or *circumstance*) is borne out by the interesting fact, noticed above, that in Homer this construction is chiefly found with the Participle which implies continuance, viz. the Present : whereas in Latin the Abl. Abs. is commonest with the Perfect Participle.

An approach to a 'Dative Absolute' may be seen in such uses as—

Π. 8. 487 Τρωσὶν μὲν ῥ' ἀέκουσιν ἔδν φάος.

12. 374 ἐπειγομένοις δ' ἴκοντο.

Od. 21. 115 οὗ κέ μοι ἀχρυνμένη τάδε δώματα πότνια μήτηρ λείποι (= *it would be no distress to me if &c.*)

which are extensions or free applications, by the help of the Participle, of the true Dat. (*Dativus ethicus*).

246*.] The Verbal Adjectives. The formations to which this term is applied resemble the Participles in some of their characteristics.

Several groups of Nouns are used as Participles or 'Gerundives' in the cognate languages, such as the Latin forms in *-tu-s*, the Sanscr. in *-ta-s*, *-na-s*, *-ya-s*, *-tava-s*, &c. Of the corresponding Greek forms the Verbal in *-το-s* is the most important, and approaches most nearly to the character of a Participle.* It is used mainly in two senses:—

(1) To express the *state* corresponding to or brought about by the action of a Verb: *τυκ-τός* *made*, *κρυπ-τός* *secret*, *κλυ-τός* *heard about, famed*, *στα-τός* *standing (in a stall)*, *τλη-τός* *enduring* (Il. 24. 49), *ἀγαπη-τός* *object of love*, *ἐρπε-τόν* *creeping thing*, *φυ-τόν* *growth, plant*, *πινυ-τός* *wise*. So with *ἀ-* *priv.*, *ἀ-κλαιτος* *unweeping*, *ἀ-παστος* *fasting*, *ἀ-πιστος* *not having news, also of whom there is no news*, *ἀ-πιστος* *faithless*, &c. The force of the Verb in these words is intransitive rather than passive, and they have no reference to *time* as past or present. Compare the Latin *aptus*, *cautus*, *certus*, *catus*, *falsus*, *scītus*, &c. We may note that there is a similar (but more complete) divergence of use between the Sanscr. Participles in *-na-s* and the Greek Adjectives in *-το-s*, as *στυγ-νός*.

(2) To express *possibility*, as *κτη-τός* *that can be acquired*, *ληϊστός* *that can be taken as plunder* (Il. 9. 406), *ῥηκτός* *vulnerable* (Il. 13. 323), *ἀμ-βα-τός* *approachable*. This meaning is chiefly found in Compounds with *ἀ-* *priv.*: as *ἀ-λυ-τος* *that cannot be loosed*, *ἀρρηκτος*, *ἀ-φυκτος*, *ἀ-λαπτος*, *ἀ-κίχητος*, *ἀ-σβεστος*, *ἀ-τλητος*, *ἀ-φθι-τος*, &c.: and in other negative expressions, as *οὐκ ὀνόμαστος*, *οὐκέτ' ὀνοστά*, *οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτῶς*, *οὐ τι νεμεσσητόν*. Hence, as Brugmann observes, it is probable that this use of the Verbal in *-το-s* began in the use with the negative.

It is evident that in respect of meaning the Verbals in *-το-s* are closely akin to the Perfect Participle. Compare (e. g.) *τυκτός* and *τετυγμένος*, *στατός* and *ἑστηώς*, *πινυτός* and *πεπνυμένος*. Hence the readiness with which in Latin they have taken the place of the Pf. Part. Passive. The extension by which they came to convey the notion of *past time* took place in the Perfect tense itself, in Latin and Sanscrit.

The Verbals in *-τέο-s* (for *-τεF-ιο-s*) are post-Homeric. The earliest instance seems to be *φα-τειό-s*, in Hesiod, Th. 310 *δεύτερον αὐτὶς ἔτικτεν ἀμήχανον, οὐ τι φατειόν, Κέρβερον κτλ.*

* See the fine observations of Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 79, p. 207.

CHAPTER XI.

USES OF THE PRONOUNS.

Introductory.

247.] The preceding chapter has dealt with the two grammatical forms under which a Noun, by acquiring a verbal or predicative character, is developed into a kind of subordinate Clause. We have now to consider the Subordinate Clause properly so called : that is to say, the Clause which contains a true (finite) Verb, but stands to another Clause in the relation of a dependent word. *E.g.* in the Sentence *λεύσσετε γὰρ τό γε πάντες ὁ μοι γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλη* *ye see that my prize goes elsewhere*, the Clause *ὁ μοι γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλη* stands in the relation of *Object* to the Verb of the principal Clause.

As the grammatical structure of Subordinate Clauses is shown in general by means of Pronouns, or Conjunctions formed from Pronominal Stems, it will be proper to begin with an account of the meaning and use of the different words of this class.

The Greek Grammarians divided the Pronouns (*ἀντωνυμίαι*) into *δεικτικά* 'pointing,' and *ἀναφορικά* 'referring' or 'repeating.' These words have given us, through the Roman grammarians, the modern terms Demonstrative and Relative; but the meaning, as often happens in such cases, has undergone a considerable change. A *Deictic* Pronoun—it will be convenient to adopt the Greek words—is one that marks an object by its position in respect to the speaker: *I, thou, this* (here), *yonder*, &c.; an *Anaphoric* Pronoun is one that denotes an object already mentioned or otherwise known,—the term thus including many 'Demonstratives' (*that* same man, *the* man, &c.), as well as the 'Relative.' In all, therefore, we may distinguish three kinds of Pronouns:—

1. **DEICTIC**, in the original sense.
2. **ANAPHORIC**, *i. e.* referring to a Noun, but Demonstrative (in the modern sense).
3. **RELATIVE**, in the modern sense.

This however, it should be observed, is a classification of the *uses* of Pronouns, not of the words or Stems themselves: for the same Pronoun may be Deictic or Anaphoric, Demonstrative or Relative, according to the context. It is probable, indeed, that all Pronouns are originally Deictic, and become Anaphoric in the course of usage.

248.] **Interrogative Pronouns.** The Interrogatives used in Homer are *τίς* (§ 108), *πότερος*, *πόστος*, *ποῖος*, *πῇ*, *πῶς*, *ποῦ*, *πόθι*,

πόθεν, πότε, πόσε. The form *πόσος* only occurs in the compound *ποσσήμαρ* (Il. 24. 657).

The Pronoun *τίς* is used both as a Substantive and as an Adjective. The adjectival use is chiefly found in the *Odyssey* (e. g. I. 225 *τίς δαίς*, *τίς δὲ ὄμιλος δδ' ἐπλετο*; 13. 233 *τίς γῆ*, *τίς δῆμος*, *τίνες ἄνδρες ἐγγεγάασι*;) and in the 24th book of the *Iliad* (Il. 367, 387). The only clear instance in the rest of the *Iliad* is 5. 633 *τίς τοι ἀνάγκη*; for in Il. I. 362., 18. 73, 80 *τί* is probably adverbial.

Notice also as peculiar to the *Odyssey* the combination of *τίς* with *ἔδε*, as Od. 6. 276 *τίς δ' ἔδε Ναυσικάῳ ἔπεται*; 20. 351 *τί κακὸν τόδε πάσχετε*; The corresponding use with *οὗτος* is only found in Il. 10. 82 *τίς δ' οὗτος* . . *ἔρχεται*; cp. H. Merc. 261 *τίνα τοῦτον ἀπηνέα μῦθον ἔειπας*;

The use of the Interrogative in Dependent Questions is rare:—

Il. 5. 85 *Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ ἂν γνῶις ποτέρουσι μετείη*.

Od. 15. 423 *εἰρώτα δὴ ἔπειτα τίς εἴη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι*.

17. 368 *ἀλλήλους τ' εἶροντο τίς εἴη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι*.

17. 373 *αὐτὸν δ' οὐ σάφα οἶδα πόθεν γένος εὐχεται εἶναι*.

With these it is usual to reckon the anomalous—

Il. 18. 192 *ἄλλον δ' οὗ τευ οἶδα τευ ἂν κλυτὰ τεύχεα δύω*.

But in this case we have the further difficulty that the form of the Principal clause leads us to expect a Relative, not an Interrogative—the Indefinite *ἄλλον τευ* standing as Antecedent: cp. Od. 2. 42 (§ 282). Hence there is probably some corruption in the text.

The use of the Interrogative in a Dependent Question doubtless grew out of the habit of announcing that a question is going to be asked. A formula, such as *ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἀπρεκέως κατάλεξον*, or *καὶ μοι τοῦτ' ἀγόρευσον ἐτήτυμον ὅφρ' ἐδ' εἰδῶ*, though grammatically a distinct sentence, may be regarded as on the way to become a governing clause. It is a step to this when there is no Pronoun as object—not 'tell me this,' but simply 'tell me': as Od. 4. 642 *νημερτές μοι ἔνισπε, πότ' ὄχρετο καὶ τίνας αὐτῷ κούροι ἔποντ' κτλ.*; 11. 144 *εἰπέ, ἄναξ, πῶς κτλ.*; 24. 474 *εἰπέ μοι εἰρομένη, τί νύ τοι νόος ἐνδοθι κεύθει*; It is to be observed that nearly all the passages of this kind are to be found in the *Odyssey* and in the 10th and 24th books of the *Iliad*. The only instance in the rest of the *Iliad* is 6. 377 *εἰ δ' ἄγε μοι, δμωαί, νημερτέα μυθήσασθε· πῇ ἔβη κτλ.*

ἔδε, κείνος, οὗτος.

249.] The Pronoun *ἔδε* is almost purely Deictic. It marks an object as near the speaker,—*this here, this on my side, &c.*; as *ναὶ μὰ τόδε σκῆπτρον* by *this sceptre (in my hand)*; *Ἐκτοπος ἦδε γυνή* *this*

is the wife of Hector; Od. 1. 76 ἡμεῖς οἶδε περιφραζώμεθα *let us here consider* (§ 162, 2): 1. 226 οὐκ ἔρανος τᾶδε γ' ἐστὶ *what I see here is not a club-feast*. It is especially applied to a person or thing to which the speaker turns for the first time, as—

Il. 3. 192 εἴπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε, φίλον τέκος, ὅς τις ὄδ' ἐστὶ.

Hence the use to denote what is *about to be* mentioned—the new as opposed to the known. This is an approach to an Anaphoric use, in so far as it expresses not *local* nearness, but the place of an object in the speaker's thought. So in—

Il. 7. 358 οἶσθα καὶ ἄλλον μῦθον ἀμείνονα τοῦδε νοῆσαι
the speech is the *present* one, opposed to a better one which should have been made.

The derivatives τοσόσδε, τοιόσδε, ὧδε, ἐνθάδε, are similarly Deictic: as Il. 6. 463 χήτεϊ τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρός *from want of a man such as I am now*.

250.] The Pronoun κείνος is sometimes used in the Deictic sense, pointing to an object as distant:—

Il. 3. 391 κείνος δ' γ' ἐν θαλάμῳ *yonder he is in the chamber*.

5. 604 καὶ νῦν οἱ πάρα κείνος Ἄρης *there is Ares at his side*.

So of an absent object: as Od. 2. 351 κείνον διομένη τὸν κάμμορον *thinking of that (absent) one, the unhappy*.

Hence in an Anaphoric use, κείνος distinguishes what is *past* or *done with*, in contrast to a new object or state of things:—

Il. 2. 330 κείνος τὼς ἀγόρευε *he (on that former occasion), &c.*

3. 440 νῦν μὲν γὰρ Μενέλαος ἐνίκησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ,
κείνον δ' αὖτις ἐγώ.

Od. 1. 46 καὶ λίην κείνός γε ζοικότι κείται δλέθρῳ·
ἀλλὰ μοι ἀμφ' Ὀδυσῆϊ κτλ.

Here κείνος marks the contrast with which the speaker turns to a new case. The literal sense of local distance is transferred to remoteness in *time*, or in the *order of thought*.

251.] The Pronoun οὗτος is not unfrequently Deictic in Homer, expressing an object that is present to the speaker, but not near him, or connected with him. Hence it is chiefly used (like *iste* in Latin) of what belongs to or concerns the person spoken to, or else in a hostile or contemptuous tone. Instances of the former use are:—

Il. 7. 110 ἀφραίνεις, Μενέλαε διοτρεφές, οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ
ταύτης ἀφροσύνης.

10. 82 τίς δ' οὗτος κατὰ νῆας ἀνὰ στρατὸν ἔρχειαι οἷος;

Od. 2. 40 οὐχ ἕκας οὗτος ἀνὴρ *the man you want is not far off*.

6. 218 στήθ' οὕτω ἀποπρόθεν *(as you are)*.

Again, οὗτος is regularly used of one of the enemy; as—

Il. 5. 257 τούτῳ δ' οὐ πάλιν αὖτις ἀποίσετον ὠκέες ἵπποι.

22. 38 μή μοι μίμνε, φίλον τέκος, ἀνέρα τοῦτον.

Similarly, with a tone of contempt,—

Il. 5. 761 ἄφρονα τοῦτον ἀνέντες (cp. 831, 879).

Od. 1. 159 τοῦτοισιν μὲν ταῦτα μέλει (of the Suitors).

More commonly, however, οὗτος is Anaphoric, denoting an object already mentioned or known. In later Greek it is often employed where Homer (as we shall see) would use the Article.

αὐτός.

252.] The Pronoun αὐτός is purely Anaphoric: its proper use seems to be to emphasise an object as the one that has been mentioned or implied,—the *very* one, *that and no other*. It conveys no local sense, and is used of the speaker, or the person addressed, as well as of a third person. Specific uses are—

(1) To distinguish a person from his surroundings, adjuncts, company, &c.: as—

Il. 3. 195 τεύχεα μὲν οἱ κείται ἐπὶ χθονὶ πολυβοτείρῃ,
αὐτὸς δὲ κτλ.

9. 301 αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ δῶρα *he and his gifts*.

14. 47 πρὶν πυρὶ νῆας ἐνιπρήσai, κτεῖναι δὲ καὶ αὐτούς.

17. 152 ὅς τοι πόλλ' ὄφελος γένητο πτόλεϊ τε καὶ αὐτῷ
to thy city and thyself.

So of the *body*, as the actual person, in contradistinction to the soul or life (ψυχή), Il. 1. 4, Od. 11. 602, &c.

Hence, too, αὐτός = *by himself* (without the usual adjuncts):—

Il. 8. 99 Τυδείδης δ' αὐτὸς περ ἔων προμάχοισιν ἐμίχθη.

So Achilles in his complaint of Agamemnon, Il. 1. 356 ἔλῶν γὰρ ἔχει γέρας αὐτὸς ἀπούρας, i. e. *at his own will*, without the usual sanction: cp. 17. 254., 23. 591.

This meaning appears also in αὐτως = *merely*, as—

Od. 14. 151 ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐκ αὐτως μυθήσομαι ἀλλὰ σὺν ὄρκῳ.

Cp. Il. 1. 520 ἥ δὲ καὶ αὐτως . . νεικεῖ *as it is* (without such provocation) *she reproaches me*.

The Gen. αὐτοῦ, &c. is used to strengthen the Possessives: as Od. 2. 45 ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος: Il. 6. 490 τὰ σ' αὐτῆς ἔργα: Il. 10. 204 ὃ αὐτοῦ θυμῷ (*suo ipsius animo*): Od. 16. 197 ὃ αὐτοῦ γε νόψ.

Hence in Il. 9. 342 τὴν αὐτοῦ φιλέει—where the use of the Art. is not Homeric—we should probably read ἣν αὐτοῦ.

(2) To express *without change, the same as before*:—

Il. 12. 225 οὐ κόσμῳ παρὰ ναῦφιν ἐλευσόμεθ' αὐτὰ κέλευθα.

Od. 8. 107 ἦρχε δὲ τῷ αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἣν περ οἱ ἄλλοι κτλ.

Hence the use with a Dat., noticed in § 144; as Od. 8. 186 αὐτῷ φάρεϊ *with his cloak as it was* (without putting it off); and so αὐτόθι, αὐτοῦ *in the place, without moving*; and αὐτῶς *without doing more*, hence *without effect, idly*: as—

Il. 2. 342 αὐτῶς γάρ ῥ' ἐπέεσσ' ἐριδαίνομεν.

(3) The unemphatic use, as it may be called, in which it is an ordinary Anaphoric Pronoun of the Third Person (Eng. *he, she, it*). In this use the Pronoun cannot stand at the beginning of a Clause (the emphatic position), or in the Nominative—an unemphasised *Subject* being sufficiently expressed by the Person-Ending of the Verb. The use is derived from that of the emphatic αὐτός in the same way that in old-fashioned English 'the same' often denotes merely the person or thing just mentioned: and as in German *derselbe* and *der nämliche* are used without any emphasis on the idea of sameness.

(4) The Reflexive use of αὐτός is very rare: Od. 4. 247 ἄλλῳ δ' αὐτὸν φωτὶ κατακρύπτων ἦσκε, and perhaps Il. 20. 55 ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς ἐριδα ῥήγνυντο βαρεῖαν (*among them there, in heaven itself*). On Il. 9. 342 τὴν αὐτοῦ φιλέει see above (1). In Il. 12. 204 κόψε γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔχοντα it is best to take αὐτόν in agreement with ἔχοντα (of the eagle). In Il. 19. 255 read αὐτόθι (§ 157).

The Reflexive Pronoun.

253.] The Pronoun εἰ (i. e. the Personal Pronoun declined from the Stems *ἐε-* or *έ-* and *σφε-*) is sometimes Reflexive (i. e. denotes the Subject of the Sentence or Clause), sometimes a simple Anaphoric Pronoun. In the latter use it is always unemphatic.

(1) The Reflexive sense is chiefly found either (a) after a Preposition, as ἀμφὶ ἐ παπτήνας *looking round him*, and so ἀπὸ εἰ, ἐπὶ οἱ, πρὸς οἱ, μετὰ σφίσι, κατὰ σφέας, &c.; or (b) when it is reinforced by αὐτός, as Il. 20. 171 ἐξ δ' αὐτὸν ἐποτρύνει μαχέσασθαι *stirs himself up to fight*. Other examples are few in number:—

Il. 2. 239 δς καὶ νῦν Ἀχιλῆα, εἰ μέγ' ἀμείνονα φῶτα κτλ.

5. 800 ἡ ὄλγιον οἱ παῖδα εἰκότα γείνατο Τυδεύς.

So Il. 4. 400., 5. 56., 24. 134, Od. 11. 433., 19. 446, 481. We should add however such Infinitival Clauses as—

Il. 9. 305 ἐπεὶ οὗ τινά φησιν ὁμοῖον οἱ ἔμεναι κτλ.

where the reference is to the Subject of the governing Verb: so

Il. 17. 407, Od. 7. 217, &c. Compare also the similar use in Subordinate Clauses, as—

Il. 11. 439 γυνὴ δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς δ' οἱ οὐ τι τέλος κατακαίριον ἦλθεν.

The strictly Reflexive use is commoner in the Iliad than in the Odyssey. Excluding Infinitival and Subordinate Clauses, there are 43 examples in the Iliad, against 18 in the Odyssey. Note that the use is mainly preserved in fixed combinations (ἀπὸ τοῦ, πρὸς τοῖς, &c.).

(2) The Anaphoric (non-Reflexive) use is very much commoner. In this use—which is doubtless derived from the other by loss of the original emphasis—the Pronoun is enclitic: whereas in the Reflexive use it is orthotone.

Accentuation. According to the ancient grammarians this Pronoun is orthotone (1) when used in a reflexive sense, (2) when preceded by a Preposition, and (3) when followed by a Case-form of αὐτός in agreement with it. The first and second rules, as we have seen, practically coincide: and the third is not borne out by the usage of Homer. In such places as Od. 2. 33 εἶθε οἱ αὐτῷ Ζεὺς ἀγαθὸν τελέσειε, Il. 6. 91 καὶ οἱ πολλὸν φίλτατος αὐτῇ, Od. 8. 396 Εὐρύαλος δέ ἐ αὐτὸν (Ὀδυσσεύς) ἀρεσσάσθω,—add Il. 24. 292, Od. 4. 66, 667., 6. 277—the Pronoun is evidently unemphatic, and is accordingly allowed to be enclitic by good ancient authorities. This is amply confirmed by the instances of μιν αὐτόν (Il. 21. 245, 318, Od. 3. 19, 237, &c.), and the parallel use of αὐτός with the enclitic μοι, τοι, &c.

In one instance, viz.—

Od. 4. 244 αὐτόν μιν πληγῇσιν ἀεικέλησι δαμάσσας

it would seem that μιν has a reflexive sense. The reading, however, is not certain, some ancient authorities giving αὐτὸν μὲν or αὐτόν μὲν.

254.] The Possessive ἐός, ὅς is nearly always Reflexive. Occasionally it refers to a prominent word in the same Sentence which is not grammatically the Subject: as—

Il. 6. 500 αἱ μὲν ἔτι ζῶν γόνον Ἑκτορα ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ.

Od. 9. 369 Οὔτιν ἐγὼ πύματον ἔδομαι μετὰ οἷς ἐτάροισι.

Cp. Il. 16. 800., 22. 404, Od. 4. 643., 11. 282., 23. 153. And it is occasionally used in a Subordinate Clause to refer to the Subject, or a prominent word, of the Principal Clause:—

Od. 4. 618 πόρεν δέ ἐ Φαίδιμος ἥρως
Σιδονίῳ βασιλεύς, ὅθ' ἐὸς δόμος ἀμφεκάλυψε
κεῖσέ με νοστήσαντα (cp. 4. 741).

Il. 10. 256 Τυδείδῃ μὲν δῶκε μενεπτόλεμος Θρασυμήδης
φάσγανον ἀμφηκες, τὸ δ' ἐνὶ παρὰ νηὶ λείπειτο.

16. 753 ἔβλητο πρὸς στήθος, ἐή τέ μιν ὤλεσεν ἀλκή.

It will be seen that where ἐός does not refer to the grammatical Subject it is generally emphatic: e.g. in the line last quoted, ἐν ἀλῇ *his own* prowess, not that of an enemy. This indicates the

original force of the Pronoun, which was to confine the reference emphatically to a person or thing just mentioned.

255.] Use of *ἐός*, *ὅς* as a general Reflexive Pronoun. It has been a matter of dispute with Homeric scholars, both ancient and modern, whether *ἐός* (*ὅς*) was confined to the Third Person Singular (*his own*) or could be used as a Reflexive of any Number and Person (*own* in general—*my own*, *thy own*, *their own*, &c.).* The question is principally one of textual criticism, and depends in the last resort on the comparative weight to be assigned to the authority of the two great Alexandrian grammarians, Zenodotus and Aristarchus. It is connected with another question, of less importance for Homer, viz. whether the forms *εὖ*, *οἶ*, *εἰ* are confined to the Singular, and those beginning with *σφ*- to the Plural.

(1) In regard to the latter of these questions there is no room for doubt. The only instance in dispute is Il. 2. 197, 198, where Zenodotus read—

θυμὸς δὲ μέγας ἐστὶ διοτρεφέων βασιλῶν
τιμὴ δ' ἐκ Διὸς ἐστι, φιλεῖ δὲ ἐμνήστια Ζεὺς,

and so the first line is quoted by Aristotle (Rhet. 2. 2). Aristarchus read *διοτρεφῆος βασιλῆος*. However, admitting Zenodotus to be right, *εἰ* need not be a Plural. The change from Plural to Singular is not unusual in passages of a gnomic character, e.g.—

Od. 4. 691 ἥ τ' ἐστὶ δίκη θείων βασιλῶν
ἄλλον κ' ἐχθαίρησι βροτῶν, ἄλλον κε φιλοίῃ.

(2) Again, the 'general' Reflexive use, if it exists in Homer, is confined to the Adjective *ἐός*, *ὅς*. The only contrary instance is Il. 10. 398 (Dolon tells Ulysses that he has been sent by Hector to find out)—

ἢ ἐφυλάσσονται νῆες θαλᾶς ὥς τὸ πάρος περ,
ἢ ἥδη χεῖρεσσιν ὑφ' ἡμετέρῃσι δαμέντες
φύξιν βουλευούτε μετὰ σφίσιν, οὐδ' ἐθέλουτε κτλ.

So the MSS., but Ar. read *βουλευούσι, ἐθέλουσι*, making Dolon repeat the exact words of Hector (Il. 309–311); and this reading, which gives *σφίσι* its usual sense, is clearly right. The Optative is not defensible (esp. after the Indic. *φυλάσσονται*), and was probably introduced by some one who thought that Dolon, speaking of the Greeks to Ulysses, must use the Second Person Plural. But the Third Person is more correct; for Ulysses is not one of

* The question was first scientifically discussed by Miklosich, in a paper read to the Vienna Academy (I, 1848, p. 119 ff.). He was followed on the same side by Brugmann (*Ein Problem der homerischen Textkritik und der vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft*, Leipzig, 1876).

the Greeks who can be supposed to be 'consulting among themselves.'

The form $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ is found as a Plural in Hom. H. Ven. 267. In later Epic poets the Substantival $\epsilon\iota\omega$, &c. are used as Reflexives of any Person or Number: see Theocritus 27. 44, Apollonius Rhodius 1. 893., 2. 635, 1278., 3. 99 (Brugmann, *Probl.* p. 80). But the use is exclusively post-Homeric.

(3) The case is different with the Adjective. We find forms of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ($\epsilon\varsigma$) read by Zenodotus in a number of places in which our MSS. and editions—following the authority of Aristarchus—have substituted other words. Thus in—

Il. 3. 244 $\delta\varsigma$ $\phi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron$, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ δ' $\eta\delta\eta$ $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\chi\epsilon\nu$ $\varphi\upsilon\sigma\iota\zeta\omicron\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\iota\alpha$,
 $\epsilon\nu$ $\Lambda\alpha\kappa\epsilon\delta\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\nu\iota$ $\alpha\upsilon\theta\iota$, $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta$ $\epsilon\nu$ $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\rho}\iota\delta\iota$ $\gamma\alpha\iota\eta$
 for $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta$ Zenodotus read $\epsilon\eta$ (*their own*). So, again, in—

Il. 1. 393 $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$, $\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota$ $\gamma\epsilon$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\omicron$ $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\delta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$,
 and in similar passages (Il. 15. 138., 19. 342., 24. 550), it is known from the Scholia that Aristarchus read $\epsilon\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$, Zenodotus $\epsilon\iota\omega$ (= *thine own*). Again, in—

Il. 11. 142 $\nu\upsilon\nu$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\delta\eta$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\rho}\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ $\lambda\acute{\omega}\beta\eta\nu$
 Zenodotus read $\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\rho}\omicron\varsigma$ (*your own father*). It is probable that he read $\omicron\upsilon$ in the similar places Il. 19. 322, Od. 16. 149, &c.

Besides the instances of undoubtedly ancient difference of reading, there are several places where one or more MSS. offer forms of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in place of $\epsilon\mu\acute{\omicron\varsigma}$ and $\sigma\acute{\omicron\varsigma}$. Thus—

Il. 14. 221 δ $\tau\iota$ $\varphi\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\iota$ $\sigma\eta\sigma\iota$ $\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ ($\eta\acute{\sigma}\iota$ D).

19. 174 $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\varphi\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\iota$ $\sigma\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ $\iota\alpha\nu\theta\eta\varsigma$ ($\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ in several MSS.).
 Similar variations (with $\varphi\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\iota$) are found in Od. 5. 206., 6. 180., 13. 362., 15. 111., 24. 357. Again—

Od. 1. 402 $\delta\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\sigma\iota$ $\sigma\acute{\omicron}\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ $\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ($\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ ten MSS.).
 Similarly in Od. 8. 242., 15. 89 ($\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\iota\sigma\iota$ for $\epsilon\mu\acute{\omicron}\iota\sigma\iota$): also—

Od. 7. 77 $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\eta\nu$ $\epsilon\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\rho}\iota\delta\alpha$ $\gamma\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$ ($\eta\nu$ $\epsilon\varsigma$ in one MS.).

13. 61 $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\pi\epsilon\omicron$ $\tau\acute{\omega}\delta'$ $\epsilon\nu\iota$ $\omicron\iota\kappa\omega$ ($\omicron\iota$ $\epsilon\nu\iota$ one MS.).

Another instance of variation is detected by Brugmann in—

Il. 9. 414 $\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ $\omicron\iota\kappa\alpha\delta'$ $\zeta\kappa\omega\mu\iota$ $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\nu$ $\epsilon\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\rho}\iota\delta\alpha$ $\gamma\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$,
 where the MSS. (except A) have $\zeta\kappa\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, pointing to $\epsilon\eta\nu$ (*my own*).*

The existing text of the Odyssey contains three passages which Brugmann claims as instances of a general Reflexive sense, viz. Od. 4. 192 (as to which see Merry and Riddell's note),

* Brugmann carries his theory into other passages where he supposes Aristarchus to have corrected the text in order to get rid of the use of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ for the First or Second Person: but the examples quoted above will suffice to give an idea of the strength of his argument.

Od. 13. 320 (where there is some reason to suspect an interpolation), and—

Od. 9. 28

οὐ τοι ἐγὼ γε

ἧς γαίης δύναμαι γλυκερώτερον ἄλλο ἰδέσθαι.

But there is no reason to take ἧς otherwise than in v. 34 ὅς οὐδὲν γλυκίον ἧς πατρίδος οὐδὲ τοκῆων γίγνεται *nothing is sweeter than a man's own country*, &c. The reference of the Pronoun is to a typical or imaginary person, as in Od. 1. 392 αἰψά τε οἱ δὴ ἀφ-
νειὼν πέλεται *a man's house* (when he is a king) *quickly grows rich*.

We have seen that post-Homeric poets use the substantival εὖ, &c. in the sense in question. The corresponding use of the adjective ἐός, ὅς is still more common, as Brugmann shows. It is found in Hesiod for the Third Person Plur. (Op. 58, Theog. 71), and in Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, and Quintus Smyrnaeus (*Probl.* pp. 28, 78–83).

(4) In attempting to arrive at a conclusion on this matter we must begin by understanding that the issue does not lie between supposing on the one hand that Aristarchus was entirely right, and on the other hand that he introduced a strange form like ἐῆος on his own authority, and merely to satisfy a theory. The latter is improbable, not only from the respect for manuscript authority which is expressly attributed to him, but also because the various readings are not all capable of being explained on this supposition. Thus, (1) the word ἐῆος is proved to exist by Od. 14. 505, 15. 450, and in the latter place ἐοῖο, though excluded by the sense, is found as a variant. Also (2) ἐῆος is found for ἐοῖο meaning *his own* in Il. 14. 9., 18. 71, 138. It cannot therefore be regarded as certain that ἐῆος was systematically introduced merely to get rid of ἐοῖο = *my own, thy own*. Again, (3) the use of the Article in τοῦ πατρός, τῆς μητρός, τοῦ παιδός, is not clearly un-Homeric (see § 258). And if in Il. 11. 763 οἶος τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀπονήσεται Bentley was right in reading ἧς (cp. 17. 25), it follows that the Article might creep in for οὗ, ἧς, &c. apart from the intention of carrying out a grammatical theory.

On the other side it must be conceded that the generalised Reflexive use of ἐός, ὅς,—if not of the substantival εὖ, &c.—is of high antiquity, so that sporadic instances of it may have occurred in the genuine text of Homer. If so, the error of Aristarchus will consist in a somewhat undue purism.

Brugmann holds that the general Reflexive sense is the primary one, belonging to the Stem *sva* in the original Indo-European language, and surviving in the Homeric use of ἐός, ὅς. But even if the readings of Zenodotus which give this sense are right, it does not follow that they represent the oldest use of the Pronoun.

Brugmann has himself given excellent instances of the extension to the First and Second Person of a Reflexive Pronoun originally confined to the Third (*Probl.* pp. 119 ff.). In the present case it is significant that the generalised use of the substantival forms *ἐο*, &c. is clearly post-Homeric. If *ἐός* (*ὅς*) is sometimes used in Homer, as well as afterwards, of the First and Second Persons, it is natural to see in this the result of an extension of usage. The case is different with the use of the Stem *sva* for the Plural. That use, as we see from the Latin *se* and *suus*, was the original one. It is noteworthy that this undoubtedly primitive use is precisely the one of which there is least trace in Homer.

ὁ ἡ τό.

256.] The Article *ὁ ἡ τό* may be defined as a purely Anaphoric Pronoun, conveying some degree of emphasis. It differs from *ὅδε οὗτος* and *ἐκεῖνος* in the absence of Deictic meaning: for while it usually marks some contrast between objects, it does not distinguish them as *near* or *far*, *present* or *absent*, &c. On the other hand it is distinguished from the non-Reflexive use of *αὐτός* and *ἐο* by greater emphasis.

Three chief uses of *ὁ ἡ τό* may be distinguished:—

1. The use as an independent Pronoun; *ὁ ἡ τό* = *he she it*. This may be called the SUBSTANTIVAL use: it embraces the great majority of the instances in Homer.
2. The use as an 'Article' in the later sense of the term, *i. e.* with a Noun following. This may be called the ATTRIBUTIVE use.
3. The use as a Relative.

257.] The Substantival Article. This use of the Article is very much the commonest in Homer, and it is also the use from which the others may be easily derived.

The Substantival Article either (1) is simply 'resumptive,' recalling a person or thing already mentioned, as *ὁ γάρ* for *he*, *τόν ῥα* *him I say*, *αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ δῶρα* *the man and his gifts*: or (2) marks a contrast, as *ὁ δέ* *but the other*.

The following points of usage are to be noticed:—

1. The most frequent—we may almost say the regular—place of the Article is at the beginning of a Clause, followed by *μέν*, *δέ*, *γάρ*, *ἄρα*, or preceded by *αὐτάρ*, *ἀλλά*, *ἦ τοι*, or an equivalent Particle. Hence the familiar combinations *ὁ μὲν*, *ὁ δέ*, *ὁ γάρ*, *καὶ γὰρ ὁ*, *αὐτὰρ ὁ*, *ἦ τοι ὁ*, *τόν ῥα*, *ἀλλὰ τόν*, &c. of which it is needless to give instances.

The later Substantival use with *μέν* and *δέ* is a surviving frag-

ment of this group of uses. A few others are found in Attic poets, as *ὁ γάρ* (Aesch. Sept. 17, Soph. El. 45, O. T. 1082).

The use to contrast *indefinite* persons or things (*ὁ μὲν—ὁ δὲ=one—another, οἱ μὲν—οἱ δὲ=some—others*) is not very common in Homer.

The use of the Article with an adversative Particle (*δέ, αὐτάρ, ἀλλά*) generally marks a change of Subject: *ὁ δέ but the other, &c.* But this is not always the case: *e.g.* Il. 4. 491 τοῦ μὲν ἄμαρβ', ὁ δὲ Λεύκον . . . βεβλήκει *him he missed, but smote Leucus* (so Il. 8. 119, 126, 302., 11. 80, &c.); Il. 1. 496 Θέτις δ' οὐ λήθε' ἐφετμέων παιδὸς ἐοῦ, ἀλλ' ἥ γ' ἀνεδύσσετο κτλ.: *cp.* Il. 5. 321., 6. 168, Od. 1. 4, &c. The Article in all such cases evidently expresses a contrast: not however between two persons, but between two characters in which the same person is thought of.

This last use—in which the Article is pleonastic, according to Attic notions—occurs in Herodotus, as 5. 120 τὰ μὲν πρότερον οἱ Κᾶρες ἐβουλεύοντο μετήκαν, οἱ δὲ αὐτῆς πολεμεῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀρτέοντο. We may compare it with the pleonastic use of the Pronoun in—

Il. 11. 131 ζώγρει Ἀτρεὺς νιέ, σὺ δ' ἄξια δέξαι ἄποινα,
where the effect of inserting *σὺ* is to oppose the two acts denoted by *ζώγρει* and *δέξαι ἄποινα*.

2. The Article is frequent in Disjunctive sentences:—

Il. 12. 240 εἴ τ' ἐπὶ δεξι' ἴωσι πρὸς ἧω τ' ἡέλιόν τε,
εἴ τ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ τοί γε κτλ. (*or else to left*).

Od. 2. 132 ζώει δ' ἡ τέθηκεν.

Here also it serves to contrast the alternative things said about the same Subject.

3. The principle of contrast often leads to the placing of two Articles together: Il. 21. 602 ἦος δ' τὸν πεδίλιον διώκετο, 10. 224 καὶ τε πρὸ δ' τοῦ ἐνόησεν. So an Article and a Personal Pronoun, ἐν δὲ σὺ τοῖσι (Il. 13. 829, &c.); *cp.*—

Il. 8. 532 εἴσομαι εἴ κέ μ' ὁ Τυδείδης κρατερὸς Διομήδης
παρ νηῶν πρὸς τεῖχος ἀπώσεται, ἢ κεν ἐγὼ τὼν.

Note that when the second of the two is in the Nom., it usually takes *γε*: hence τοῦ δ' γε, τῇ δ' γε, &c.

4. The Article often stands for the object to be defined by a following Relative Clause, *e.g.*—

Il. 9. 615 καλὸν τοι σὺν ἔμοι τὸν κήδειν ὅς κ' ἐμὲ κήδη.

1. 272 τῶν οἱ νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσι &c.

The use is to be classed as Anaphoric; the intention of saying something about the object is equivalent to a previous mention. So in Latin the Anaphoric *is* is used to introduce *qui*.

The Neuter Article is similarly used to introduce Clauses beginning with *ὅτε*, *ὥς*, and the like:—

Il. 15. 207 ἐσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυκται ὅτ' ἄγγελος αἴσιμα εἰδῆ.

Od. 9. 442 τὸ δὲ νῆπιος οὐκ ἐνόησεν ὥς οἱ κτλ.

Il. 3. 308 Ζεὺς μὲν πού το γέ οἶδε . . . ὀπποτέρῳ κτλ.

So Il. 14. 191., 20. 466., 23. 545. It may even introduce an independent sentence, as—

Od. 4. 655 ἀλλὰ τὸ θαυμάζω· ἴδον ἐνθάδε Μέντορα δῖον.

5. The uses in which the Article is least emphatic (*i. e.* does not begin the Clause, or express a contrast) appear to be—

(a) after Prepositions: esp. in the Dat. Plur. after *μετά*, *παρά*, *πρὸς*, *σύν*, *ἐν*, *ἅμα*: as Il. 1. 348 ἡ δ' ἀέκουσ' ἅμα τοῖσι γυνὴ κίεν. This is to be connected with the fact that the forms *ἐο*, *οἱ*, *οἶ*, *οἶσι*, &c. are not used with Prepositions in the simple Anaphoric sense (§ 253), and thus the Art. is used instead of them.

(b) when the Neuter Article is used for a fact or set of facts; as Il. 4. 353 ὄψεαι ἦν ἐθέλησθα καὶ αἷ κέν τοι τὰ μεμήλη. Here again the want of a corresponding form of *ἐο* makes itself felt. This use is chiefly found in the Nom. and Acc.; but also in *τοῦνεκα* *therefore*, *ἐκ τοῦτο* *from that time*, &c.

258.] The Attributive Article. The Attributive Article is found in Homer in a limited range of cases, and has evidently grown out of the use of the Substantival Article followed by a Noun in 'Apposition'; *e.g.* Il. 4. 20 ὡς ἔφαθ', αἱ δ' ἐπέμνξαν Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη *thus he spoke, but they murmured, Athene and Here*: Il. 1. 348 ἡ δ' ἀέκουσ' ἅμα τοῖσι γυνὴ κίεν. So with *μιν*, Il. 21. 249 ἵνα μιν παύσειε πόνοιο | δῖον Ἀχιλλῆα, *cp.* Od. 11. 570. In such cases the Pronoun is still substantival, the Noun being added by way of afterthought.

It is a step towards an Attributive use when the Article *needs* the addition of the Noun to explain it; *e.g.*—

Il. 4. 501 τὸν ῥ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐτάριοιο χολωσάμενος βάλε δουρὶ
κόρσην· ἡ δ' ἐτέρωιο διὰ κροτάφοιο πέρησεν
αἰχμὴ χαλκείη.

Here *ἡ δέ* would not be clear without *αἰχμὴ*. So in—

Il. 1. 408 αἷ κέν πως ἐθέλῃσιν ἐπὶ Τρώεσσιν ἀρῆξαι,
τοὺς δὲ κατὰ πρύμνας τε καὶ ἄμφ' ἄλα ἔλσαι Ἀχαιοὺς.

Od. 15. 54 τοῦ γάρ τε ξείνος μμνήσκειται ἥματα πάντα
ἄνδρὸς ξεινοδόκου.

So too with Proper Names,—when a *new* person is about to be mentioned the Art. *anticipates* the Noun: *e.g.*—

Il. 2. 402 αὐτὰρ ὁ βοῦν ἱέρευσεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων.

And where the Neut. τό is followed by an epexegetic Infinitive:—

Od. i. 370 ἐπεὶ τό γε καλὸν ἀκούμεν ἐστὶν αἰδοῦ.

Il. 17. 406 ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ τὸ ἔλπετο πάμπαν,
ἐκπέρσειν πολλῖεθρον ἀνεν ἔθεν.

In all these cases the combination of Article and Noun is not sufficiently close to constitute an Attributive use; but they serve to show how such a use is developed.

The Attributive uses in Homer may be classified as follows:—

1. Uses with *connecting Particles*, where some contrast is made in passing to the new sentence or clause.
2. Uses with certain *Adjectives* that imply contrast.
3. Uses to mark a person or thing as *definite*.

259.] Article of Contrast—with connecting Particles. The uses that fall under this head, though not very numerous, are characteristic of Homer. The following are the chief:—

(a) The Article with an adversative δέ, αὐτάρ, &c. is not unfrequently used to bring out the contrast in which the Noun stands to something already mentioned: *e.g.*—

Il. 2. 217 φολκὸς ἔην, χωλὸς δ' ἕτερον πόδα, τὰ δέ οἱ ὦμα κτλ.
but then his shoulders; so τὰ δέ οἱ ὅσσε (Il. 13. 616), &c.

Il. 22. 405 ὥς τοῦ μὲν κεκόνυτο κάρη ἄπαν, ἡ δέ νυ μήτηρ κτλ.
but on the other hand his mother &c.

Il. 1. 382 ἦκε δ' ἐπ' Ἀργείοισι κακὸν βέλος, οἱ δέ νυ λαοὶ
θυήσκον ἐπασσύτεροι, τὰ δ' ἐπ' ἔφχετο κῆλα θεοῖο.

4. 399 τοῖος ἔην Τυδεὺς Αἰτώλιος· ἀλλὰ τὸν νῖδν κτλ.

So we should explain the Article in Il. 1. 20 παῖδα δέ μοι λύσαιτε φίλην, τὰ δ' ἄποινα δέχεσθαι *release my daughter, and on the other side accept ransom*. The usage is common in the Iliad, but perceptibly rarer in the Odyssey.

(b) The use of the Art. with μέν—in contrast with something that follows—is rare: Il. 11. 267 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τὸ μὲν ἔλκος ἐτέρεστο: cp. 8. 73., 9. 1., 13. 640., 19. 21., 20. 75, Od. 3. 270 (seemingly the only instance in the Odyssey). There is a similar use with the Art. following the Noun in Od. 1. 116 μνηστήρων τῶν μὲν σκέδασιν κατὰ δώματα θείη, κτλ.

(c) The corresponding use with copulative and illative Particles, καί, τε, ἡδέ, καὶ γάρ, is much less common: cp.—

Il. 1. 339 πρὸς τε θεῶν μακάρων πρὸς τε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων
καὶ πρὸς τοῦ βασιλῆος ἀπηνέος.

15. 36 ἴστω νῦν τόδε γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὑπερθεῖν,
καὶ τὸ κατειβόμενον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ (cp. 18. 486).

Od. 22. 103 δώσω δὲ συμβώτῃ | καὶ τῷ βουκόλῳ ἄλλα.

Il. 14. 503 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ Προμάχοιο δάμαρ κτλ.

The Article singles out its Noun as the special object intended, or turns to it with fresh emphasis. So with an Infinitive, Od. 20. 52 ἀνίη καὶ τὸ φυλάσσειν, where we need not take τὸ φυλάσσειν closely together. So Hes. fr. 192 ἡδὺ δὲ καὶ τὸ πυθέσθαι κτλ. also Op. 314 τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι ἄμεινον.

These uses should be carefully distinguished from the later Definite Article. For instance, in Il. 1. 20 τὰ ἄποινα does not mean *this* or *the* ransom, in contradistinction to other ransoms. It means *the other, the ransom*, in contrast to the person ransomed. Again, the 4th book of the Iliad begins οἱ δὲ θεοί, which we naturally take to mean simply *but the gods*. But, taking in the last line of the 3rd book, we have—

ὡς ἔφατ' Ἀτρεΐδης, ἐπὶ δ' ἦνεον ἄλλοι Ἀχαιοί·
οἱ δὲ θεοὶ παρ' Ζηνὶ καθήμενοι ἡγορόωντο.

Clearly the Article marks the turning from the one scene to the other,—from the battlefield to Olympus. Thus the Attic οἱ (θεοί) distinguishes the gods from other beings: the Homeric οἱ (δὲ θεοί) marks, not this permanent distinction, but the contrast arising out of the particular context.

The difference appears also in the use with Proper Names. In Attic the Article shows that a particular known person is spoken of; in Homer it marks the turning of attention to a person—ushers in the name, as it were. In short, the Homeric Article *contrasts*, the Attic Article *defines*.

260.] With Adjectives. The Article is used before adjectival words that imply a contrast or distinction, especially between definite or well-known alternatives: in particular—

(a) ἄλλος and ἕτερος, *passim*: also αὐτός = *same*.

(b) Comparatives and Superlatives; οἱ πλείους, οἱ ἄριστοι, &c. So in the adverbial expressions τὸ πρῖν, τὸ πάρος, τὰ πρῶτα, and the like, in which the Neut. Article is used adverbially (τὸ πάρος = *then formerly*). It is quite different when a Masc. or Fem. Article is used with an Adverb, as οἱ ἔνερθε θεοί (Il. 14. 274), ἀνδρῶν τῶν τότε (Il. 9. 559), τὰ τ' ἐνδόθι καὶ τὰ θύρηφιν (Od. 22. 220),—a use which is extremely rare in Homer.

(c) Ordinal Numerals: as τῇ δεκάτῃ: so τὸ ἦμισυν. Also Cardinal Numerals, when a *division* is made; as Il. 5. 271 τοὺς μὲν τέσσαρας αὐτὸς ἔχων ἀτίταλλ' ἐπὶ φάτνῃ, τὼ δὲ δὺ' Αἰνεία δῶκεν *four he kept, and the (other) two he gave to Aeneas*: Il. 11. 174 πάσας· τῇ δὲ τ' ἱῆ κτλ. (*the lion chases*) *all, but to one &c.*

(d) Possessives; τὸν ἐμὸν χόλον, τὰ σὰ κῆλα, &c.

(e) A few words expressing the standing contrasts of great and small, many and few, good and evil, &c., esp. when the contrast is brought out by the context:—

Il. 1. 106 μάντι κακῶν, οὗ πῶ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυνον εἶπας·
αἰεὶ τοι τὰ κάκ' ἔστι φίλα φρεσὶ μαρτεύεσθαι.

3. 138 τῷ δέ κε νικήσαντι φῖλη κεκλήσῃ ἄκοιτις
(*the conqueror being one of two definite persons*).

So ἡ πλῆθὺς (Il. 2. 278., 15. 305) *the many* (in contrast to a single man, or to the few): τὸ χθιζόν (Il. 13. 745); τὸν δεξιὸν ἵππον (Il. 23. 336); Αἴας ὁ μέγας *the greater Ajax*: θεοὺς . . τοὺς ὑποταρταρίους (Il. 14. 279) *the gods of the lower world*: ἄνακτες οἱ νέοι (Od. 14. 61) *masters of the younger generation*: ἰχθύσι τοῖς ὀλίγοις (Od. 12. 252) *the smaller kinds of fish*. So—

Il. 1. 70 ὃς ἤδη τὰ τ' ἐόντα τὰ τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα.

The use to contrast *indefinite* individuals (*one—another*) is rare in Homer: Il. 23. 325 τὸν προὔχοντα δοκεύει *waits on the one in advance*: Il. 16. 53 ὁππότε δὴ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἀνὴρ ἐθέλησιν ἀμέρσαι: Il. 9. 320 κάτθαν' ὁμῶς ὃ τ' ἄεργος ἀνὴρ ὃ τε πολλὰ ἐοργῶς: Od. 17. 218 ὥς ἀεὶ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει θεὸς ὥς τὸν ὁμοῖον.

(f) *Patronymics and geographical epithets*: e.g. Il. 11. 613 Μαχάονι πάντα ἔοικε τῷ Ἀσκληπιάδῃ (cp. 13. 698., 14. 460., 23. 295, 303, 525): Il. 2. 595 Θάμωρι τὸν Θρήϊκα: Il. 6. 201 πεδίου τὸ Ἀλγίον, cp. 2. 681., 10. 11: and so perhaps Il. 21. 252 αἰετοῦ . . τοῦ θηρητῆρος *an eagle, the hunting kind*. This use is rare.

(g) In a very few places, a Genitive: Il. 20. 181 τιμῆς τῆς Πριάμου: Od. 24. 497 νείεις οἱ Δολιχίοιο: Il. 9. 342., 10. 408., 23. 348, 376, Od. 3. 145.

261.] The defining Article. The few and somewhat isolated uses which fall under this description may be grouped as follows:

1. The use before a Relative is combined with 'Apposition' to a preceding Noun: as—

Il. 5. 319 οὐδ' οὐδὲς Κανανῆος ἐλήθετο συνθεσιδῶν
τάων ὃς ἐπέτελλε κτλ. (cp. 5. 331 θεῶν τάων αἰ—).

This is the primitive order, the Article being 'resumptive'—*the injunctions, those namely which, &c.* So ἡματι τῷ ὅτε—, and commonly in the Iliad. The later order—that in which the Noun follows the Article—appears in a few places of the Iliad:—

5. 265 τῆς γάρ τοι γενεῆς ἧς Τρωτὶ περ κτλ. (cp. v. 268), also 6. 292., 8. 186., 19. 105. It is commoner in the Odyssey.

2. Occasionally the Article conveys a hostile or contemptuous tone: Il. 2. 275 τὸν λωβητῆρα: 13. 53 ὁ λυσσώδης: 21. 421 ἡ κυνάρμια: 22. 59 τὸν δύστηνον: Od. 2. 351 τὸν κάμμορον: 12. 113 τὴν ὀλοήν: 14. 235 τὴν γε στυγερὴν ὁδόν: 18. 26 ὁ μολοβρός: 18. 333 τὸν ἀλήτην: 19. 372 αἱ κύνες αἶδε. So in Il. 3. 55 ἧ τε κόμη τό τε εἶδος.

In Od. 18. 114 τοῦτον τὸν ἀναλτον does not mean (as it would in Attic) '*this ἀναλτος*,' but '*this man—ἀναλτος that he is.*' Cp.

Il. 13. 53 ἡ ῥ' ὁ γ' ὁ λυσσώδης κτλ., where ὁ λυσσώδης—the mad-man—is used as a single term, in Apposition to ὁ γε. This use—which is characteristic of Homer—may be regarded as a relic of the Deictic force of ὁ ἡ τό. It answers to the later use of *oïros*, Latin *iste*.

3. The use of the Article to show that the Noun denotes a *known* person or thing—the defining Article of later Greek—is rare in Homer. It is found in the *Īliad*—

(a) with γέρων, γεραιός, ἀναξ, ἥρως: where however the Pronoun is the important word, the Noun being subjoined as a kind of title: τοῖο ἀνακτος = 'of his lordship' (cp. the German *allerhöchst derselbe*). Accordingly, when the name is added the Art. is generally not used; as γέρων ἱππηλάτα Πηλεΐς (not ὁ γέρων).

(b) with ἔπος and μῦθος, in certain phrases, as ποῖον τὸν μῦθον εἶπες; In these cases the Noun is of vague meaning, adding little to the Article: cp. ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσε with ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε. So in the formula ὁμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὄρκον, perhaps with a touch of ceremonial verbiage.

In the *Odyssey* it occurs with several other Nouns: ὁ ξείνος (*passim*); ἡ νῆσος Od. 5. 55., 9. 146., 12. 201, 276, 403, &c.; τὰ μῆλα Od. 9. 464., 11. 4, 20: ὁ μόχλος Od. 9. 375, 378: τὸ τόξον Od. 21. 113, 305. The other examples in the *Īliad* are chiefly found in books x, xxiii, xxiv: see Il. 10. 97, 277, 321, 322, 330, 408, 497., 23. 75, 257, 465., 24. 388, 801, also 2. 80., 7. 412., 20. 147.

We may perhaps add a few uses with words of relationship:—

Il. 11. 142 οὐν μὲν δὴ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀεικέα τίσετε λώβην.

But here the Art. is resumptive with emphasis: (if ye are sons of Antimachus) *ye shall now pay for his, your father's, outrage.*

Il. 19. 322 οὐδ' εἴ κεν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀποφθιμένοιο πυθοίμην *not even if I heard of such a one as my father being dead*: Od. 2. 134 ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς κακὰ πείσομαι *for from my father (for one) I shall suffer* (cp. Il. 15. 641 τοῦ γένετ' ἐκ πατρὸς κτλ.): Od. 16. 149, Il. 21. 412. See however § 255.

It has been a question whether the Article is ever equivalent to a Possessive Pronoun. If so it would be a kind of *defining* Article—defining a thing as belonging to a known person. In most of the instances, however, the reference to a person is given by a distinct Pronoun: Il. 19. 331 ὥς ἄν μοι τὸν παῖδα κτλ.: Od. 11. 492 ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τοῦ παιδὸς κτλ.: Od. 8. 195 καί κ' ἀλαός τοι . . τὸ σῆμα: Od. 18. 380 οὐδ' ἄν μοι τὴν γαστέρ' κτλ.: Od. 19. 535 ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τὸν ὄνειρον κτλ.: Il. 1. 167 σοὶ τὸ γέρας πολὺ μέϊζον. Hence the Art. in these places has much the same

function as with a Possessive (μοι τὸν παῖδα=τὸν ἐμὸν παῖδα); it reinforces the Pronoun which conveys the idea of possession.

This account does not apply to τῆς εὐνῆς (Il. 9. 133, 275., 19. 176), and τῆς ἀρετῆς (Od. 2. 206). But here the Art. is probably substantival: τῆς εὐνῆς *her couch*, τῆς ἀρετῆς *her perfection*. In 23. 75 καὶ μοι δὸς τὴν χεῖρα the Art. is quite anomalous.

262.] The Article as a Relative. The Article at the beginning of a clause may often be translated either as a Demonstrative or as a Relative. It has the character of a Relative when the clause which it introduces is distinctly subordinate or parenthetical: as—

Il. 1. 36 Ἀπόλλωνι ἄνακτι, τὸν ἡῦκομος τέκε Λητώ
Apollo—son of the fair-haired Leto.

The use of δ ἢ τό as a Relative is less common in Homer than that of ὅς ἢ ὃ, and is restricted in general to clauses which refer to a *definite* antecedent. Thus in the line just quoted the clause τὸν ἡῦκομος τέκε Λητώ does not *define* Apollo, *i.e.* does not show who is meant by the name; it assumes that a definite person is meant, and adds something further about him.

From this principle it evidently follows that—

(1) The Art. when used as a Relative must *follow* the Noun or Pronoun to which it refers; whereas a Relative Clause often precedes. The only exceptions are—

Il. 1. 125 ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πολλῶν ἐξεπράθομεν, τὰ δέδασται.

Od. 4. 349 (= 17. 140) ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μοι ξείπε . . τῶν κτλ.

We may perhaps read ἀλλὰ θ' ἃ μὲν (§ 332).

(2) The Art. cannot stand as correlative to a Demonstrative (*i.e.* we must have τό—ὃ *that which*, not τό—τό). Hence in—

Il. 7. 452 τοῦ δ' ἐπιλήσονται, τὸ ἐγὼ καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων κτλ.
τοῦ—τό are not meant as correlatives: the sense is *and will forget the other—(a wall) which &c.* But some MSS. have ὃ τ' ἐγώ. So Od. 13. 263 (τῆς ληΐδος) τῆς εἵνεκ' ἐγὼ πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῷ *my share of the spoil—(spoil) for which I had suffered &c.* Exceptions are, Od. 14. 227 αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ τὰ φίλ' ἔσκε τὰ που θεὸς ἐν φρεσὶ θῆκεν, 19. 573 τοὺς πελέκεας τοὺς κτλ. (perhaps also Od. 9. 334).

(3) The Art. is not used in *epexegetic* clauses, as Il. 2. 338 νηπιάχοις, οἷς οὐ τι μέλει κτλ., Il. 5. 63 ἀρχεκάκους, αἱ πᾶσι κακὸν κτλ., Il. 15. 526 Λαμπετίδης, ὃν Λάμπος ἐγείνατο.

Instances at variance with the general principle are to be found in Il. 5. 747 ἡρώων τοῖσιν τε κορέσσεται (οἰσιν τε in some MSS.), Il. 9. 592 κῆδε' ὅσ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλει τῶν ὅσιν ἄλῳγ, also Il. 17. 145., 18. 208, Od. 1. 17., 6. 153., 11. 545., 16. 257., 23.

355, &c. It is probable however that the text is sometimes at fault, the Art. having been substituted for δ s, especially in order to avoid hiatus: *e.g.*—

Il. 17. 145 οἶος σὺν λαοῖσι τοῖ 'Ιλίῳ (λαοῖς οἱ Φιλίῳ).

Od. 16. 263 ἐσθλῷ τοι τοῦτω γ' ἐπαμύντορε τοὺς ἀγορεύεις, (where οὗς is not excluded by the hiatus, § 382).

As the Art. usually adds some new circumstance about a known antecedent, it sometimes has the effect of representing a fact as *unexpected*: as Il. 1. 392 τὴν μοι δόσαν νῆες Ἀχαιῶν (*Briseis*)—*whom the Greeks gave me* (=although the Greeks had given her to me): Od. 16. 19 μῶνον τηλύγετον, τῷ ἐπ' ἄλγεα πολλὰ μογήσῃ *his only son, after he has endured many sorrows about him* (cp. 19. 266., 23. 6): Il. 1. 160 πρὸς Τρώων, τῶν οὐ τι μετατρέπει *the Trojans—while you pay no heed to them*. So in—

Il. 1. 319 λῆγ' ἐριδος τὴν πρῶτον ἐπηπείλησ' Ἀχιλλῆϊ, the meaning is not *the same quarrel which he had declared*, but *his quarrel—now that he had declared it*. And so—

Od. 19. 393 οὐλήν, τὴν ποτέ μιν σὺς ἤλασε *a wound—one that once a boar gave him*. Similarly τῇ = *at a place where* (Il. 14. 404., 21. 554., 23. 775).

The Acc. Neut. τό used adverbially means *wherefore* (§ 133), as—

Il. 3. 176 ἀλλὰ τὰ γ' οὐκ ἐγένοντο· τὸ καὶ κλαίονσα τέτηκα. So Il. 7. 239., 12. 9., 17. 404., 19. 213., 23. 547. There is one instance in the *Odyssey*, in the song of Demodocus (8. 332).

The Relational use does not extend to the Adverbs *τῶς*, *τότε*, *τέως* (*τῆς*), or to the derivative adjectives *τοῖος*, *τόσος*, &c.

263.] The Article with τε serves as a Relative. In accordance with the use of τε in Homer (§ 332) δ τε expresses a constant or general characteristic, but only of a *definite* Antecedent: as—

Il. 6. 112 Ἔκτορι Πριαμίδῃ, τὸν τε στυγέουσι καὶ ἄλλοι.

15. 621 κύματά τε τροφόμεντα, τὰ τε προσερεύγεται αὐτήν.

Od. 18. 273 οὐλομένης ἐμέθεν, τῆς τε Ζεὺς ὄλβον ἀπηύρα.

It is especially used in similes (where a *typical* case is described), as Il. 13. 390 πίτυς βλωθρὴ τὴν τ' οὔρεσι κτλ.: Il. 5. 783., 11. 554., 12. 146., 13. 571., 15. 581., 23. 712, &c.

264.] Homeric and Attic Article. After the account given in the preceding §§ of the Homeric uses of the Article it is hardly necessary to show in detail where they differ from the corresponding uses in Attic Greek. What we have chiefly to observe is that the difference is often greater in reality than it appears to be at first sight. Familiar as we are with the de-

fining Article of modern languages, and of Attic Greek, we naturally import it into Homer whenever it is not made impossible by the context. But even when a Homeric use falls under the general head of the 'defining Article' (§ 261), the effect is perceptibly different from that of the 'Definite Article' properly so called. In Homer the Article indicates, not that a person or thing is a known or definite one, but *that it is presented to us in an antithesis or contrast*. Objects so contrasted are usually definite, in the sense that they are already known or suggested by the context: and hence the readiness with which the later defining sense can be applied to passages in Homer. Thus αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἥρως can usually be translated *but the hero (before mentioned)*, as though ὃ distinguished him from other heroes. But when we find that αὐτὰρ ὃ in Homer constantly means *but he*, or *but the other*, and that it may be followed by an epexegetic Noun (as αὐτὰρ ὃ βοῦν ἰέρευσεν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων), we see that ὃ is more important than a mere Article, is in fact a Substantival Pronoun, to which ἥρως is added as a kind of epithet—*but he the hero*.

This point has been explained in connexion with the use of the Attributive Article, § 259, *a*. It may be further illustrated from instances in which the Article marks contrast, *but not definition*, and consequently cannot be translated by *the*. Such are:—

Il. 15. 66 πολέας δλέσαντ' αἰζήους
τοὺς ἄλλους, μετὰ δ' εἶδον ἐμὸν Σαρπηδόνα διόν
not *the others*, but *others as well, certain others*.

Il. 5. 672 ἢ προτέρω Διὸς εἶδον ἐριγδούποιο διώκοι,
ἢ ὃ γε τῶν πλεόνων Λυκίων ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἔλοιτο
or *should take the lives of more Lycians instead*. Here οἱ πλέονες does not mean 'the greater number,' but 'a greater number,' in contrast to the one person mentioned.

Il. 22. 162 ὥς δ' ὄτ' ἀεθλοφόροι περὶ τέρματα μώνυχες ἵπποι
ρίμφα μάλα τρωχῶσι· τὸ δὲ μέγα κείμεν ἀεθλον
and *there a great prize lies ready*. So Od. 20. 242 αὐτὰρ ὁ . .
ὄρνις *but a bird*. The same thing is shown by μνηστήρων τῶν
μὲν κτλ. (§ 259, *b*). It is evident that τῶν is used, not because
the suitors are definite persons, but because a contrast is made
by μὲν.

The same remark applies to the use with Adjectives (§ 260), especially to the use by which they are turned into Substantives, as τὸ κρήγγον, τὰ κακά. In Homer τὰ κακά is said because in the particular context κακά evils are opposed to good. In Attic τὰ κακά or τὸ κακόν implies that evils form a *class* of things, distinguished from all other things. This again is a difference,

which does not come out in translating Homer, and is therefore apt to be overlooked.

The use with Cardinal Numerals (§ 260, *c*) is to be similarly explained. It is not peculiar to Homer, but is regular in Attic also, where it may be regarded as a survival of the Homeric use of the Article.

The use of the Art. in Hesiod shows some advance. Thus the use to form a class is no longer confined to the case of a particular contrast given in the context: Op. 280 τὰ δίκαι' ἀγορεύσαι, Op. 353 τὸν φιλέοντα φιλεῖν καὶ τῷ προσιόντι προσεῖναι. The use with Adverbs is commoner, Op. 365 τὸ θύρηφιν, Op. 457 τῶν πρόσθεν. The Prepositional phrase in Op. 364 τὸ ἐν οἴκῳ κατακείμενον is quite post-Homeric. The same may be said of the 'articular' Inf. in Op. 314 τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι ἀμεινον (§ 259, 3). It will be found that the Art. occurs nearly twice as often in Hesiod as in Homer.

It is a further question, and one that cannot be fully discussed here, whether any uses of the Article found in our text of the Iliad and Odyssey are post-Homeric, and evidence of a later origin of the books or passages where they occur. It will be seen that in the case of the uses which have been noticed as rare or exceptional most of the examples come from books ix, x, xxiii, and xxiv. See especially the uses treated of in § 260*f, g*, and § 261, 3. Others again seem to belong to the Odyssey; see § 261, 3, and cp. § 259, *a*. The use of the Article in the 10th book of the Iliad seems clearly later than in any other part of Homer: *e. g.*—

Il. 10. 97 δεῦρ' ἐς τοὺς φύλακας καταβήομεν.

277 χαῖρε δὲ τῷ ὄρνιθ' Ὀδυσσεύς.

322 ἣ μὲν τοὺς ἵππους τε καὶ ἄρματα κτλ. (80 330).

408 πῶς δ' αἱ τῶν ἄλλων Τρώων φυλακαὶ κτλ.

Also πεδίον τὸ Τρωϊκόν (v. 11), ὁ τλήμων Ὀδυσσεύς (v. 231, 498), τὴν νύκτα (v. 497). So in the Catalogue of the Ships we have Θάμριν τὸν Θρήϊκα (Il. 2. 595), and τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος (2. 681).

ὅς ἢ ὅ.

265.] The Pronoun ὅς ἢ ὅ, and the Adverbs formed from the same Stem, esp. ὥς, ὅτε, ἕως, are occasionally used in a Demonstrative or quasi-Demonstrative sense; viz.—

(1) After καί, οὐδέ, μηδέ: as Il. 21. 198 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅς δειδοίκε even he fears: Il. 6. 59 μηδ' ὅς φύγοι may not even he escape: and often in the combinations καὶ ὥς even so, οὐδ' ὥς not even so. So οὐδ' ἐνθα not even there (Od. 1. 18).

(2) With μέν and δέ, to express a contrast between indefinite objects: as—

Il. 11. 64 ὥς Ἐκτωρ ὅτε μέν τε μετὰ πρώτοισι φάνεσκεν, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐν πυμάτοισι κτλ. (so 18. 599., 20. 49).

12. 141 οἱ δ' ἣ τοι ἦος μὲν κτλ. up to a certain time.

17. 178 ὅτε δ' αὐτὸς ἐποτρύνει but sometimes &c.

(3) In the Adverb ὥς so; especially as the second member of

the Correlation $\delta\varsigma$ — $\delta\varsigma$ *as—so*. A single $\delta\varsigma$ is often used where it may be either a Relative or a Demonstrative, as in the formula $\delta\varsigma$ φάτο, $\delta\varsigma$ εἰπών, &c. : cp. the Latin *quae quum dixisset*, &c. The other instances in which we have to translate $\delta\varsigma$ as a Demonstrative are rare : *e.g.* Il. 3. 339 $\delta\varsigma$ δ' αὐτως *and in like manner*.

Among Demonstrative uses of $\delta\varsigma$ it is usual to count the use with γάρ, as $\delta\varsigma$ γάρ, $\omega\varsigma$ γάρ, *ὅνα γάρ*. This however is an error, arising from the occasional use of γάρ where it cannot be translated *for* : see § 348, 3.

Some commentators find a Demonstrative $\delta\varsigma$ in—

Od. 4. 388 τὸν γ' εἴ πως σὺ δύναιο λοχησάμενος λελαβέσθαι,
 $\delta\varsigma$ κέν τοι εἴησιν ὁδόν κτλ.

Here however the clause $\delta\varsigma$ κέν τοι κτλ. is not the Apodosis, but a Relative Clause expressing *purpose*. The peculiarity of the passage is merely that the Apodosis is left to be understood : *if you can seize him, (do so), that he may tell you &c.* : cp. Od. 5. 17., 10. 539.

These idioms are usually regarded as the remains of an earlier use of $\delta\varsigma$ in the simple Anaphoric sense. The growth of a Relative out of a Demonstrative has been already exemplified in the Article (§ 262). But the Relativial use of $\delta\varsigma$ is so ancient that any attempt to trace its growth from an earlier syntax must be of very uncertain value.

266.] $\delta\varsigma$ τε, $\delta\varsigma$ τις. The simple $\delta\varsigma$ may be used in any kind of Relative Clause, although in certain cases (§ 262) the Article is preferred. Thus we have—

Il. 4. 196 $\delta\upsilon$ τις ὀστρεύσας ἔβαλεν (a particular fact).

1. 403 $\delta\upsilon$ Βριάρεων καλέουσι (a constant, characteristic fact).

In these two places the Art. might be put in place of $\delta\varsigma$: but not in—

Il. 2. 205 εἰς βασιλέως, ϕ ἔδωκε (a characteristic fact, defining).

1. 218 $\delta\varsigma$ κε θεοῖς ἐπιπελθεται (definition of a class).

So $\delta\varsigma$ is used to convey a *reason* (which implies a *general* cause or tendency) : as Od. 1. 348 Ζεὺς αἴτιος $\delta\varsigma$ τε δίδωσιν κτλ. ; cp. Il. 2. 275., 5. 650., 8. 34.

If the Relative is meant to refer to an indefinite number of individuals falling under a common description, $\delta\varsigma$ τις is generally used, = *who being any one, whoever*.

If, again, the Relative Clause generalises by making us think, not so much of all possible *individuals* in a class, as of different times and circumstances,—in other words, if it lays stress on the general and permanent element in facts— $\delta\varsigma$ τε is used : *e.g.*—

Il. 1. 279 σκηπτούχως βασιλέως, ϕ τε Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκε *to whom as king, to whom in every such case*.

Π. 4. 361 τὰ γὰρ φρονέεις ἃ τ' ἐγὼ περ (*such things as &c.*).

5. 545 Ἀλφειοῦ ὅς τ' εὐρὺ ρέει (cp. 5. 876).

9. 117 ἀνὴρ ὃν τε Ζεὺς κῆρι φιλήσῃ.

Od. 7. 74 οἰσὶν τ' εὖ φρονέῃσι *they to whom she is well inclined.*

Thus ὅς τε is constantly used in *comparisons*: as Π. 3. 61 (πέλεκυς) ὅς τ' εἰσιν διὰ δουρὸς ὑπ' ἀνέρος ὅς ῥά τε τέχυν νήϊον ἐκτάμνησι.

So ὡς τε, ὅθι τε, ὅθεν τε, ὅτε τε: ἔνθα τε, ἵνα τε: ὅσος τε, οἷός τε.

Od. 12. 22 δισθανέες, ὅτε τ' ἄλλοι ἅπαξ θνήσκουσ' ἀνθρωποι.

19. 179 Κνωσός, μεγάλη πόλις, ἔνθα τε Μίνως κτλ.

Thus Homer has *five* Relatives, viz. ὅς, ὅς τε, ὅς τις, ὅ, ὃ τε, each with a distinct use: Attic retains only ὅς and ὅς τις.*

267.] Correlative Clauses. 1. We have first to distinguish between the simple structure in which the Relative Clause only qualifies a Noun or Pronoun in the Principal Clause, as—

τῶν οἱ νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσι *of those who are now living.*

ἐν πεδίῳ ὅθι περ κτλ. *in the plain where &c.*

and the *parallel* structure, in which the Relative is an Adverb of the same form as the Antecedent; as—

τὼς δέ σ' ἀπεχθήρω ὡς νῦν ἔκπαγλ' ἐφίλησα.

τόφρα δ' ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι τίθει κράτος, ὅφρ' ἂν Ἀχαιοὶ κτλ.

τῇ ἴμεν ἢ κεν δὴ σύ, κελαινεφές, ἡγεμονεύῃς.

Here the notion given by the adverbial ending—*manner, time, way, &c.*—is the point of comparison, and must be understood to qualify both clauses.

In both these kinds of compound sentence the Demonstrative Antecedent may often be omitted, but this is especially the case with the second, in which a Relational Adverb implies a *corresponding* Demonstrative. Thus ὡς ἐφίλησα implies τὼς—ὡς ἐφίλησα: ὅφρ' ἂν is equivalent to τόφρα—ὅφρ' ἂν, &c.

In this way, then, it came about that ὡς (lit. *in which manner*) means *in the manner in which*: and so ὅφρα *to the time up to which*, ἢ *by the way by which*, ὅθι *at the place where*, ὅτε *at the time when*, and so on.† The whole Relative Clause in fact serves as an Adverb (of *manner, time, way, &c.* as the ending may determine), construed with the Verb of the Principal Clause. Such clauses accordingly are called *adverbial*: while clauses which merely qualify a Noun or Pronoun are *adjectival*.

* It is worth notice that ὅς τις in Attic has some of the uses of ὅς τε: see Jowett, *Thucyd.* ii. p. 372, Stein, *Hdt.* 4. 8.

† In the corresponding sentences in English it is often the Relative that is wanting: thus τῇ ἴμεν ἢ κεν ἡγεμονεύῃς *to go by the way [by which] you lead.* This forms a characteristic difference between Greek and English Syntax.

2. The omission of the antecedent from the governing clause leads to various idiomatic uses :—

(a) The Relative Clause comes to be equivalent to a Noun or Pronoun in any Case which the governing clause may require : thus—

Π. 5. 481 τὰ τ' ἐέλδεται ὅς κ' ἐπιδενής *which (he) desires who is in need.*

1. 230 δῶρ' ἀποαιρεῖσθαι ὅς τις σέθεν ἀντίον εἶπη *to take away gifts (from him, from any one) who &c.*

7. 401 γνωτὸν δὲ καὶ ὅς μάλα νήπιός ἐστιν.

Od. 15. 281 αὐτὰρ κείθι φιλήσεται οἷά κ' ἔχωμεν *you will be entertained (with such things) as we have.*

Π. 14. 81 βέλτερον ὅς φεύγων προφύγη κακόν *it is better (for one) who by flying escapes evil, i.e. it is better when a man &c. : cp. Od. 15. 72, Π. 3. 109.*

(b) The omission is especially characteristic of clauses with ὅτε *when* (for τὸ—ὅτε *the time when*) : Π. 15. 18 ἧ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε *do you not remember (the time) when* : Π. 8. 229 πῇ ἔβαν εὐχολαί, ὅτε δὴ κτλ. *where are gone the boastings (of the time) when &c. : Π. 19. 337 λυγρὴν ἀγγελίην ὅτ' ἀποφθιμένοιο πύθεται : and with Numerals, Π. 21. 80 ἥως δέ μοι ἐστὶν ἡδε δωδεκάτη ὅτε κτλ. this is the twelfth morn (from the time) when &c. So in Π. 2. 303 χθιζά τε καὶ πρωΐς' ὅτε means a day or two (from the time) that. Hence too the forms εἰς ὅτε *to the time that*, πρὶν γ' ὅτε *before the time when*.*

Similarly with ὅθι *where*, as ἱκανὸν ὅθι *they came (to the place) where*.

(c) With a Verb of *saying* or *knowing* the Relative Clause has apparently the force of a dependent question :—

Π. 2. 365 γνώσῃ ἔπειθ' ὅς θ' ἡγεμόνων κακός, ὅς τέ νυ λαῶν, ἡδ' ὅς κ' ἐσθλὸς ἔρσι

you will recognise (γινώσκω, not οἶδα) of the leaders him who is a weakling, and who of the people, and again him who shall be (found to be) brave.

So Π. 13. 278., 21. 609, Od. 3. 185., 17. 363 : compare the form with the antecedent expressed—

Π. 23. 498 τότε δὲ γνώσεσθε ἕκαστος ἵππους Ἀργείων, οἳ δεῦτεροι οἳ τε πάροιθεν.

The construction is the same with a Verb which *implies* knowing, finding out, or the like : *e.g.*—

κλήρω νῦν πεπάλασθε διαμπερὲς ὅς κε λάχρησι *cast lots (to find him) whose portion it shall be.*

3. The suppressed antecedent, again, may have no clear or grammatical construction :—

(a) This is especially found when the Relative Clause expresses a *reason*, as—

Od. 4. 611 αἱματος εἰς ἀγαθοῖο, φίλον τέκος, οἷ' ἀγορεύεις
lit. *you are of good blood (seeing the things) such as you speak, i.e.*
as I see by the manner of things that you speak.

Il. 14. 95 νῦν δέ σευ ὠνοσάμην πάγχυ φρένας οἶον ξείπες
I blame your thought, because of the kind of thing you have said.

Od. 2. 239 νῦν δ' ἄλλωφ δῆμωφ νεμεσίζομαι, οἶον ἅπαντες
ἦσθ' ἄνεωφ *at the way that ye all sit silent.*

Il. 17. 586 Ἔκτωρ, τίς κέ σ' ἔτ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν ταρβήσειεν,
οἶον δὴ Μενέλαον ὑπέτρεσας;
who would fear you any more, seeing the way you shrank before Menelaus?

Od. 15. 212 οἷος ἐκείνου θυμὸς ὑπέρβιος, οὗ σε μεθήσει.

Il. 16. 17 ἥε σύ γ' Ἀργείων ὀλοφύρεαι ὥς ὀλέκονται.

Od. 10. 326 θαυμά μ' ἔχει ὥς κτλ. *I wonder at the way that &c.*

This is the idiom generally described by saying that οἷος is put for ὅτι τοιοῦτος, ὥς for ὅτι οὕτως, and so on. So when ὅς introduces a reason (§ 266) we might say that it is for ὅτι οὗτος (*e.g.* Ζεὺς αἴτιος ὅς τε δίδωσι = ὅτι οὗτος δίδωσι). The peculiarity, however, of the clauses now in question is that the Relative can have no grammatical Antecedent, that is to say, that the Correlative which it implies as an Antecedent has no regular construction in the Principal Clause.

(b) This is also found after Verbs of *knowing*, &c.—the Relative Clause expressing the Object or *thing* known : as—

Il. 2. 409 ἦδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀδελφείον ὥς ἐπονείτο
he knew of his brother (as to the manner) in which he laboured.

24. 419 θηοῖο κεν . . οἶον ἐερσήεις κείται.

Od. 7. 327 εἰδήσεις . . ὅσων ἀρισται νῆες ἐμαί.

This is evidently an extension of the form γνώση δς κακός (*supra*, 2 c), with the difference that the suppressed Correlative in the Principal Clause is without a regular construction.

(c) Sometimes the Relative Clause is used without any Principal Clause, as an exclamation : *e.g.*—

Il. 7. 455 ὦ πόποι, Ἐννοσίγαι' εὐνυσθενές, οἶον ξείπες.

Od. 1. 32 ὦ πόποι, οἶον δὴ νῦ θεοὺς βροτοὶ αἰτιώωνται.

Il. 5. 601 ὦ φίλοι, οἶον δὴ θαυμάζομεν Ἔκτορα.

The ellipse gives an expression of surprise : (*to think*) *what a thing you have said !* (*to see*) *how men blame the gods !* (*to remember*)

how we wondered at Hector! The want of a construction has much the same effect as with the exclamatory use of the Nominative (§ 163). Similarly—

Od. 4. 240 πάντα μὲν οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
 ὅσσοι Ὀδυσσεύς ταλασίφρονός εἰσιν ἄεθλοι·
 ἀλλ' οἷον τόδ' ἔρεξε κτλ.

I will not tell of all his feats: but (just to mention) what a feat this was that he did &c. So Od. 4. 269., II. 517; cp. also II. 5. 638 ἀλλ' οἷον τινά φασι κτλ. (*just to instance*) *the kind of man that they tell &c.*

If the explanation now given of these Relative Clauses is right, it is evidently incorrect to accent and punctuate as is done by editors (*e.g.*) in—

II. 6. 108 φᾶν δέ τιν' ἀθανάτων ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος
 Τρωσὶν ἀλεξήσοντα κατελθέμεν' ὥς [or ὡς] ἐλέλιχθεν

taking it as an Independent Clause—'so they wheeled.' The same editors do not hesitate to write in II. 16. 17 ὀλοφύρεαι, ὥς ὀλέκονται, where the construction is precisely the same.

It is sometimes maintained that in all such cases we have a survival of the primitive 'parataxis'—that (*e.g.*) ὀλοφύρεαι ὥς ὀλέκονται was originally ὀλοφύρεαι, ὥς ὀλέκονται *you lament, they so perish, hence you lament how they perish, or that they thus perish.* On the same view the exclamatory οἷον ξείπες is not elliptical, but represents the original independent *what a thing you have said!* (See Mr. Leaf on II. 2. 320 θανμάζομεν οἷον ἐτύχθη). This hypothesis, however, is not borne out by the facts of language. In the first place, it is strange that the traces of parataxis should be found with the Relatives ὥς, οἷος, ὅσος, &c. rather than with the corresponding Demonstrative forms. Again, if the Relative retained an original Demonstrative use, we should expect to find this, like other survivals, in some *isolated* group of uses: whereas the clauses now in question are very various in character. Again, the passages which favour the notion of parataxis are indistinguishable in structure from others to which it cannot be applied, such as most of the examples given under 2. Yet we cannot separate τὰ τ' ἐέλδεται ὅς κ' ἐπιδενῆς from φιλήσεται οἷά κ' ἔχωμεν, or that again from ἀνοσάμην οἷον ξείπες. In particular it will be found that the theory does not apply to clauses which are *conditional* so well as to those which give a *reason*. The exclamatory use—οἷον ξείπες and the like—does not furnish a good argument, because the pronoun used in a simple exclamation would not be Demonstrative, but Interrogative (ποῖον ξείπες, &c.). The most decisive consideration, however, is that the Relative use of ὅς and its derivatives is common to Greek and Sanscrit, and may be regarded therefore as Indo-European. Consequently there is a strong presumption against any hypothesis which explains the Homeric use of the Relative from a still earlier or pre-Indo-European stage of language.

4. Sometimes an Antecedent is not construed with the Governing Clause, but follows the Case of the Relative. This is allowed if the Antecedent is separated from its own clause, as—

II. 14. 75 νῆες ὅσαι πρῶται εἰρύαται ἄγχι θαλάσσης
 ἔλκωμεν (so II. 6. 396., 10. 416., 14. 371).

This 'Inverse Attraction' may be placed with the forms in which the Antecedent is wanting, because it can only arise when the original construction of the Antecedent (ἐλκωμεν νῆας ὅσαι—) has been forgotten.

5. Again, the Correlative structure is liable to an extension, the characteristic of which is that the Relational Adverb *has no proper construction in its own clause.*

This may be most clearly seen in the use of οὐνεκα (*i.e.* οὐ ἔνεκα) *for which reason*: *e.g.*—

Π. 1. 110 ὥς δὴ τοῦδ' ἔνεκά σφιν ἐκηβόλος ἄλγεα τεύχει,
οὐνεκ' ἐγὼ . . οὐκ ἔθελον κτλ.

Apollo causes sorrow for this reason, that I would not &c. Here we cannot translate οὐνεκα *for which reason*: the reason does not precede, but is given by the Relative Clause. That is, the first ἔνεκα is rational; the second is logically unmeaning. Hence the οὐνεκα can only be due to the correlation: as it is usually expressed, οὐνεκα is *attracted* to the antecedent τοῦνεκα. Then—since οὐνεκα comes to imply a correlative τοῦνεκα—the antecedent τοῦνεκα is omitted, and the relational οὐνεκα by itself comes to mean *for the reason that, because.*

The process may be traced more or less distinctly in all the Relational Adverbs. Thus ὥς (*in which manner*) comes to mean *in such manner that*: and so ὅφα for *so long that*, ἵνα (*lit. where*) to *the end that*. Also, as will be shown presently, ὅ, ὅτι and ὅ τε are Adverbial Accusatives, meaning literally *in which respect*, hence *in respect that, because*: *cp.* εἰπὼν ὅ τι ἐχόσατο *to say for what he was angered with* χόσατο ὅτι *he was angered for (the reason) that*. The qualifying force of the Adverb is transferred from its own clause to the Verb of the Governing Clause.

On the same principle ἐκ τοῦ ὅτε *from the time when* becomes ἐξ οὗ (*for ἐκ τοῦ οὗ*): and εἰς τὸ ὅτε becomes εἰς ὃ *to the time that*.

268.] οὐνεκα. This Conjunction (which may be treated as a single word) is used in two ways:—

- (a) to assign a *cause* or *reason*:
- (b) to connect the fact expressed in the Relative Clause with a Verb of *saying, knowing, &c.*

The second of these uses is evidently derived from the first by a kind of degeneration, or loss of meaning. The *fact* told or known is originally given as the *ground* of the saying or knowing. The transition may be seen in—

Od. 7. 299 ξείν', ἦ τοι μὲν τοῦτό γ' ἐναΐσιμον οὐκ ἐνόησε
παῖς ἐμή, οὐνεκά σ' οὐ τι μετ' ἀμφιπόλοισι γυναιξιν
ἦγεν ἐς ἡμέτερον

my daughter did not judge aright in this, because she did not &c., more simply, in this, that she did not &c. Again—

Od. 5. 215

οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς

πάντα μάλ’, οὐνεκα σείο περίφρων Πηνελόπεια κτλ.

I know all, inasmuch as Penelope is &c.; i.e. I know that she is. This use is found with Verbs of *saying* in Od. 13. 309., 15. 42., 16. 330, 379. In the *Iliad* it occurs only once, viz. Il. 11. 21 πεύθετο . . μέγα κλέος, οὐνεκ’ Ἀχαιοί κτλ.

Note that (except in Od. 13. 309., 16. 379) the Verb is followed by an Acc. of the *thing*; so that the Relative Clause does not directly take the place of the Object. Thus (*e.g.*) πεύθετο κλέος οὐνεκα is literally *heard a rumour the ground of which was that &c.*

A peculiar use to state a *consequence* which is made the *ground* of inference may be seen in Il. 9. 505 ἡ δ’ Ἀτὴ σθεναρὴ τε καὶ ἀρτίπος, οὐνεκα πάσας πολλὸν ὑπεκπροθέει *Ate is strong and sound of foot, (as we know) because she &c.*

269.] δ, ὅτι, ὅ τε. The Acc. Neut. of the Relative, when used adverbially (§ 133), yields the three ‘Conjunctions’ δ, ὅτι, ὅ τε, which mean properly *in respect that*, hence usually (*a*) *because*, or (*b*) *that* (after a Verb of *saying, knowing, &c.*). The antecedent τό is generally wanting, but is found in a few instances: as Il. 19. 421 τὸ οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς, ὅ τοι κτλ.: Il. 5. 406 οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδε . . ὅττι μάλ’ οὐ δηναῖός κτλ.: Il. 1. 120 λεύσσετε τό γε πάντες, ὅ μοι κτλ.; also Il. 15. 217., 19. 57., 20. 466, and Od. 13. 314 (seemingly the only instance in the *Odyssey*). These places, however, serve to show the origin of the idiom. We have here the phenomenon already noticed in § 267, 5, viz. the Relative has no construction in its own Clause, but reflects the construction of the Demonstrative in the principal Clause. *E.g.* Il. 20. 283 ταρβήσας ὃ οἱ ἄγχι πάγῃ βέλος δρέδων *dreading because the dart stuck near him* represents an older ταρβήσας (τὸ) ὃ πάγῃ βέλος. The adverbial Accusative with ταρβήσας would express the *nature or ground* of dread (as in τό γε δειδῖθι, τότε χῶεο, &c.); hence the meaning *dreading in respect of* (or *because of*) *this, that the dart stuck*. Accordingly we find δ = *because* chiefly with Verbs of *feeling*, which regularly take a Neuter Pronoun of the *ground* of feeling.*

* The Clauses of this type are the subject of Dr. Peter Schmitt’s monograph, *Ueber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen* (Würzburg, 1889). He rightly takes δ (ὅτι, &c.) to be an Acc. of the ‘inner object’ (§ 133), but he seems to have overlooked the real difficulty; which is that δ supplies an object to the Verb of the principal Clause, not to the Verb of its own Clause. Thus he says ‘ὁρῶ δ νοσεῖς war ursprünglich: ich weiss, was du krankst; οἶδ’ ὃ σε ἐπηνεσε ich weiss, was er dich gelobt hat’ (p. 21). But the

(1) *ὅ* in respect that, because may be exemplified by—

Il. 16. 835 Τρωσὶ φιλοπολέμοισι μεταπρέπω, *ὃ σφιν ἀμύνω ἡμᾶρ ἀναγκαῖον* (for that I keep off).

Od. 1. 382 Τηλέμαχον θαύμαζον *ὃ θαρσαλέως ἀγόρευε*.

So Il. 9. 534 (χωσαμένη), Od. 19. 543., 21. 289 (*οὐκ ἀγαπᾷς ὃ*).

The use to state a consequence as a ground of inference (like that of *οὐνεκα* in Il. 9. 505, § 268) occurs in—

Od. 4. 206 τοῖον γὰρ καὶ πατρός, *ὃ καὶ πεπνυμένα βάσεις* for you are of a wise father, (as I know) because you speak wisely: so Od. 18. 392, and probably also—

Il. 21. 150 τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν, *ὃ μεν ἔτλης ἀντίος ἐλθεῖν*; who are you that you dare &c.

The transition to the use of *ὅ* = that may be seen in—

Od. 2. 44 οὔτε τι δῆμιον ἄλλο πιφαύσκομαι οὐδ' ἀγορεύω ἀλλ' ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος, *ὃ μοι κακὸν ἐμπεσεν οἴκῳ* what I tell is my own case (which consists in the fact) that evil has fallen on my house. It is common with *οἶδα*, *γινώσκω* (Il. 5. 433, &c.), *αἶω* (Il. 15. 248): and is found with Verbs of seeing, as Il. 1. 120 *λεύσσετε γὰρ τό γε πάντες ὃ μοι γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλα γε σέε* this, that my prize goes elsewhere (Il. 19. 144., 22. 445, Od. 17. 545).

(2) *ὅτι* because is common after the Verbs of feeling. We need only stop to notice some instances (parallel to those of *ὃ* just quoted) in which *ὅτι* is = as I know because:—

Il. 16. 33 *νηλεές, οὐκ ἄρα σοί γε πατήρ ἦν ἱππότα Πηλεΐς, οὐδὲ Θέτις μήτηρ, γλαυκὴ δέ σε τίκτε θάλασσα, πέτραι τ' ἡλίβατοι, ὅτι τοι νόος ἐστὶν ἀπηνής* meaning now I know that you are no child of Peleus &c., because your mind is relentless. So—

Il. 21. 410 *νηπύτι', οὐδέ νύ πώ περ ἐπεφράσω ὅσσον ἀρείων εὐχομ' ἐγὼν ἔμεναι, ὅτι μοι μένος ἀντιφερῖς*.

Od. 5. 339 *κάμμορε, τίπτε τοι ὦδε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων ὠδύσατ' ἐκπάγλως, ὅτι τοι κακὰ πολλὰ φυτεύει* why is Poseidon so enraged against you (as he seems to be) since he

two meanings, I know in what respect you are sick and I know that you are sick are quite distinct, and are given by essentially different constructions of the Relative. Let us take as example a Clause which follows a Verb of feeling: *ἐχώσατο ὅτι οἱ βέλος ἐκφυγε χειρός*. The construction with *ἐχώσατο* is the Acc. of the 'inner object' (as *τόδε χάσο, τό γε δεῖδιθι*, &c.). But *ὅτι* is in a different Clause from *ἐχώσατο*: the full construction would be *ἐχώσατο (τὸ) ὅτι*. Schmitt would say that *ὃ τὶ ἐκφυγε* also is an Acc. of the 'inner object,'—that the sentence meant originally *was angered in respect of this in respect of which it flew out*. It is surely more probable that *ἐχώσατο ὃ τὶ* was like *ἐξ οὗ* from the time that, *εἰς ὃ* to the time that, *οὐνεκα* for the reason that, &c. (§ 267, 5), so that *ὃ τὶ* was an Acc. by Attraction, and had no real construction with its own Verb.

causes you many evils? So Π. 10. 142., 21. 488., 24. 240, Od. 14. 367., 22. 36.

The transition to the meaning *that* may be seen in—

Π. 2. 255 ἦσαι ὀνειδίζων ὅτι οἱ μάλα πολλὰ διδοῦσι
reproaching him in respect that, with the fact that, &c. 24. 538.
 It is the regular meaning with Verbs of *knowing*: Π. 8. 175
 γινώσκω δ' ὅτι μοι πρόφρων κατένευσε Κρονίων *I know that &c.*
 Cp. Π. 1. 536 οὐδέ μιν Ἥρη ἠγνόησεν ἰδοῦσ' ὅτι οἱ κτλ.: 24. 563
 καὶ δέ σε γινώσκω . . ὅτι θεῶν τίς σ' ἦγε.

The use of ὅτι=*that* is commoner in the *Iliad* than in the *Odyssey* (where ὥς and οὖνεκα partly supply the place, see § 268).

(3) The form ὃ τε (so written by Bekker to distinguish it from ὅτε *when*) is found in Homer with the same varieties of meaning as ὃ and ὅτι. Thus we have ὃ τε = *because* in—

Π. 1. 244 χῳόμενος ὃ τ' ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισας
angry because &c.; Π. 6. 126., 16. 509, Od. 8. 78. So—

Od. 5. 356 ὦ μοι ἐγώ, μή τίς μοι ὑφαίνῃσιν δόλον αἰτε
 ἀθανάτων, ὃ τέ με σχεδὴς ἀποβῆναι ἀνάγει
i. e. there is a snare in this bidding me to get off the raft. So
 probably Π. 1. 518 ἡ δὲ λοίγια ἔργ' ὃ τέ μ' κτλ. *it is a pestilent*
thing that you &c.; Π. 19. 57 ἡ ἄρ τι τόδ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἄρειον
 ἔπλετο ὃ τε κτλ.: and the exclamatory use (§ 267, 3, c) in Π. 16.
 433 ὦ μοι ἐγών, ὃ τε κτλ. *alas for me that &c.*

Again, ὃ τε is = *as I know because*, in—

Π. 4. 31 δαιμόνιη, τί νύ σε Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες
 τόσσα κακὰ ρέζουσιν, ὃ τ' ἀσπερχές μενεαίνει
how do Priam and his sons do you such evil, (as they must do) since
you are furiously enraged?

Π. 15. 467 ὦ πόποι, ἡ δὲ πάγχυ μάχης ἐπὶ μῆδεα κείρει
 δαίμων ἡμετέρης, ὃ τέ μοι βιδὸν ἐκβαλε χεῖρός
(as I judge from this) that he has thrown the bow from my hands.
 So Od. 13. 129 ὃ τέ με βροτοὶ οὐ τι τίουσιν *for that mortals honour*
me not: Od. 14. 89 οἷδε δέ τοι ἴσασι . . ὃ τ' οὐκ ἐθέλουσι *they know*
something (as is plain) because they are not willing: Od. 21. 254
 τοσσόνδε βίης ἐπιδευέες εἰμὲν . . ὃ τ' οὐ δυνάμεσθα *we are so want-*
ing in strength, as appears by the fact that we are not able.

With Verbs of *knowing*, again, ὃ τε has the meaning *that*—

Π. 1. 411 γυνὴ δὲ καὶ Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρυκρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
 ἦν ἄτην, ὃ τ' ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισεν
may know his folly, in that he failed to honour &c.

Od. 14. 365 ἐγὼ δ' εὖ οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς
 νόστον ἐμείο ἄνακτος, ὃ τ' ἤχθετο πᾶσι θεοῖσι
I know of the return of my lord, that (as it showed) he was hated

by all the gods. So Il. 8. 251 εἶδονθ' ὃ τ' ἄρ' κτλ. *saw that &c.*; and with γινώσκω, Il. 5. 231, &c.

The existence of a distinct ὃ τε with the meaning *because* or *that* depends upon its being shown that in places such as those now quoted the word cannot be either ὅτι *that* or ὅτε *when*. The latter explanation of the reading ὅτε (or ὅτ') is often admissible, e.g. in Il. 14. 71 ἥδεα μὲν γὰρ ὅτε—, οἶδα δὲ νῦν ὅτε—; cp. Il. 15. 207 ἐσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυκται ὅτ' . . εἰδῆ, and instances in Attic, as Soph. O. T. 1133 κάτοιδεν ἥμος κτλ. *he knows well of the time when &c.*, Eur. Troad. 70 οἶδ' ἡνίκ' Αἴας εἶλκε. But the supposition of a distinct ὃ τε is supported by a sufficient number of examples in Homer,—e.g. Il. 5. 331 γινώσκων ὃ τ' ἀναλκίς ἔην θεός, —and generally by the complete correspondence of meaning thus obtained between ὃ, ὅτι, and ὃ τε. On the other hand it is extremely improbable that the ι of ὅτι was ever capable of elision. In this respect ὅτι *that* stands on the same footing as τί and ὅτι. Moreover, the adverbial use of these words, which gives them the character of Conjunctions, is only a slight extension of the ordinary Acc. of the Internal Object (§ 133). Hence if the Neut. of ὅς and ὅς τις is used in this way, it is difficult to see any reason why the Neut. of the equally familiar ὅς τε should be excluded. The ancient authorities and the MSS. vary in some places between ὅτε and ὅτι (as in Il. 14. 71, 72., 16. 35, Od. 13. 129), and on such a point we have no good external authority.

270.] ὃ, ὅτι, ὃ τε as Conjunctions. In a few instances it is impossible to explain these Relatives by supplying an Accusative τὸ in the principal Clause. Thus in—

Od. 20. 333 νῦν δ' ἤδη τόδε δῆλον, ὃ τ' οὐκέτι νόστιμός ἐστι
the Antecedent is a Pronoun in the Nom. Similarly in—

Il. 5. 349 ἣ οὐχ ἅλις ὅτι γυναικας ἀνάλκιδας ἡπεροπεύεις;
the principal Clause is Impersonal, and the Antecedent might be a Nom. (*is it not enough*) or Gen. (*is there not enough in this*), but hardly an Accusative. Again in—

Il. 8. 362 οὐδέ τι τῶν μέμνηται, ὃ οἱ μάλα πολλάκις κτλ.

17. 207 τῶν ποιῶν, ὃ τοι κτλ. (*as amends for the fact that*)
the Relative Clause serves as a Genitive: cp. Od. 11. 540 γηθοσύνη ὃ οἱ κτλ., 12. 374 ἄγγελος ἦλθεν . . ὃ οἱ κτλ.

Add Il. 9. 493 τὰ φρονέων ὃ μοι κτλ., 23. 545 τὰ φρονέων ὅτι οἱ κτλ.: and also Od. 2. 116 τὰ φρονέουσ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν ᾧ οἱ κτλ., where the *v. l.* ὃ for ᾧ has good MS. authority.

In these instances, then, the forms ὃ, &c. have ceased to be felt as Case-forms, and may properly be termed Conjunctions.

The Mood in all Clauses of this kind is the Indic.—not the Opt., as in some Attic uses (Goodwin, § 714).

It may be worth while pointing out the parallel between this extension of the Relative Clause and the development which has been observed in the use of the Infinitive (§ 234). In the first instance the Clause serves as epexegetis of an Acc. with a Verb of *saying, knowing, feeling, &c.* (§ 237, 2): *μη δειδῆναι τινα* *fear not any one, for being likely to see; ταρβήσας* (τὸ) *δ' ἄγχι πάγῃ βέλος* *fearing (this), that the spear stuck near him.* Then the Acc. is used without reference to the construction of the principal Verb and consequently the dependent Clause may stand to it as logical Subject: *οὐ τι νημεσσητὸν βασιλῆα* *ἀπαρῆσασθαι* *for a king to make his peace is no shame; οὐχ ἅλις ὅτι ἡπεροπεύεις* *is (the fact) that you deceive not enough;—*where the Clause in both cases serves as a Nom. Finally the Clause is used as an indeclinable Noun of any Case: *τῶν μέμνηται* *δ' κτλ.* *remembers this, that &c.;* to which corresponds the so-called 'articular Infinitive,' or Inf. with the Article as a Substantive.

The three forms *ὃ, ὃ τε, ὃτι* do not differ perceptibly in meaning. Hence the reduction in Attic to the single *ὃτι* is no real loss.

270*.] Indirect Discourse. Clauses introduced by *ὃ* (*ὃ τε, ὃτι*), *ὥς, οὕνεκα* after Verbs of *saying* and *knowing* are evidently of the nature of *oratio obliqua*, or indirect quotation of the words of another person.

The Homeric language has no forms of Syntax peculiar to Indirect Discourse (such as the use of the Opt. or Pres. Indic. after a Secondary Tense). Every assertion is made from the speaker's own point of view: consequently what was present to the person quoted must be treated as now past. Accordingly the Present Tense of the *oratio directa* becomes the Impf., the Pf. becomes the Plpf. The Future is thrown into past time by the help of *μέλλω*, as in *οὐδὲ τὸ ἤδη δ' οὐ πείσεσθαι* *ἔμελλεν* *he knew not that he would not be persuaded.* The only exception to this is *Od. 13. 340 ἤδε' δ' νοστήσεις* *I knew that you will* (i. e. *would*) *return.* For an instance of the Opt. with *ὥς* after a Verb of *saying* see § 306, 2: and cp. the Dependent Question, § 248.

The Clauses now in question are commoner after Verbs of *knowing, hearing, remembering, &c.* than after Verbs of *saying.* Of the former kind there are about 70 in Homer; of the latter, which may be counted as examples of true Indirect Discourse, there are 16. Of these, again, only three are in the *Iliad* (16. 131., 17. 654., 22. 439). This confirms the view that these Clauses are originally causal, the meaning *that* being derived from the meaning *because* (§ 268). If we confine ourselves to *ὃ* (*ὃ τε*) and *ὃτι* the proportion is still more striking, since out of more than 50 instances there are only four with a Verb of *saying**.

271.] Form of the Relative Clause. It is characteristic of the Relative Clause that the Verb *to be* is often omitted: as—

Il. 8. 524 *μῦθος δ' ὃς μὲν νῦν ὑγιής, εἰρημένος ἔστω,*

* The figures are taken from Schmitt (*Ursprung des Substantivsatzes*), but include instances of *ὃ τε* which he refers to *ὃτε* when.

and so ὅσσοι Ἀχαιοί, οἳ περ ἄριστοι, ἢ τις ἀρίστη, ὅς τ' αἴτιος ὅς τε καὶ οὐκί, &c. Hence we should write in Il. 11. 535., 20. 500 ἀντὺγες αἱ περὶ δόφρον, in Il. 21. 353, ἰχθύες οἱ κατὰ δίνας. So with the Adverbs; as Od. 10. 176 ὅφρ' ἐν νηὶ θοῇ βρώσις τε πόσις τε *so long as there is food and drink in the ship*.

1. This ellipse leads to a peculiar 'Attraction' into the Case of the Antecedent, found chiefly with ὅσος τε, as—

Od. 10. 113 τὴν δὲ γυναῖκα | εὖρον ὅσην τ' ὄρεος κορυφήν, which is equivalent to τόσην ὅση ἐστὶ κορυφή; and so ὅσον τε, Od. 9. 322, 325., 10. 167, 517., 11. 25; also οἷόν τε, Od. 19. 233. The only instance in the Iliad is somewhat different:—

Il. 1. 262 οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἴδον . . οἷον Πειρίθοον κτλ.

The later Attraction of the Relative into the Case of the Antecedent is not found in Homer. Kühner gives as an example Il. 5. 265 τῆς γάρ τοι γενεῆς ἧς Τρωτὶ περ εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς δῶκε. But there the Gen. is partitive: 'the brood *from* which Zeus gave' (§ 151 e). So Il. 23. 649 (§ 153).

2. Another effect of this omission may be found in the use of double Relativel forms, especially ὥς ὅτε *as (it is) when*; which again may be used without any Verb following: *e.g.*—

Il. 13. 471 ἀλλ' ἔμεν' ὥς ὅτε τις σὺς οὐρῶσιν ἀλκί πεποιθώς, ὅς τε μένει κτλ.

So ὥς εἰ and ὥς εἴ τε *as (it would be) if*, as in Il. 5. 373 τίς νύ σε τοιάδ' ἔρεξε . . ὥς εἴ τι κακὸν ῥέζουσιν.

A similar account is probably to be given of the peculiar double Relative—

Il. 8. 229 πῇ ἔβαν εὐχολαί, ὅτε δὴ φάμεν εἶναι ἄριστοι, ἃς ὁπότ' ἐν Λήμνῳ κενεαυχέες ἡγοράσθη
when once (whenever it was) you made boast in Lemnos.

3. The want of a finite Verb also leads to the construction of οἷος, ὥς, &c. with the Infinitive. This is only beginning in Homer: see § 235. It arises by a kind of mixture or 'contamination' of two simple constructions, viz.—

(1) the ordinary Inf. with the Demonstratives τοῖος, τηλίκος, &c. (§ 232); as τοῖοι ἀμυνέμεν *of the kind to defend* (Od. 2. 60), μένειν ἔτι τηλίκος *of the age for remaining* (Od. 17. 20);

(2) the Correlative form, such as Il. 5. 483 τοῖον οἷόν κ' ἡ ἐφύοιεν Ἀχαιοὶ ἢ κεν ἄγοιεν: Il. 7. 231 ἡμεῖς δ' εἰμὲν τοῖοι οἱ ἀν σέθεν ἀντιάσαιμεν.

Thus (*e.g.*) Od. 21. 172 τοῖον . . οἷόν τε ῥητῆρα βιοῦ τ' ἔμεναι καὶ οἰστῶν combines the forms τοῖον ἔμεναι *of the kind to be* and τοῖον οἷός τε (*ἐστὶ*) *of the kind that (is)*. In other words, the con-

struction of τοῖος is transferred to the Correlatives τοῖος—οἷος. Then τοῖος is omitted, and we get οἷος with the Inf. The same may be said of ὡς τε with the Inf., which is post-Homeric.

272.] Double Relative Clauses. When a Relative introduces two or more Clauses connected by καί or δέ, it need not be construed with any Clause after the first: *e.g.*—

Il. 1. 162 ᾧ ἐπὶ πόλλ' ἐμόγησα, δόσαν δέ μοι υἱες Ἀχαιῶν
for which I toiled, and which the sons of the Greeks gave me.

Od. 2. 114 τῷ δτεφ' τε πατὴρ κέλεται καὶ ἀνδάνει αὐτῇ
and who is pleasing to herself. The Relative is not repeated in any Clause of this form; but its place is often taken by another Pronoun (usually an enclitic, or an unemphatic αὐτός):—

Il. 1. 78 ἣ γὰρ ὄτομαι ἄνδρα χολωσέμεν, δς μέγα πάντων
Ἀργείων κρατεῖ καὶ οἱ πελθονται Ἀχαιοί.

Od. 9. 19 εἴμ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, δς πᾶσι δόλοισιν
ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καὶ μεν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἔκει.

This idiom, it should be observed, is not peculiar to Homer, but prevails in all periods of Greek (Kühner, II. p. 936).

On the same principle, when a succession of Clauses is introduced by a Relational Adverb, the first Verb may be in the Subj. or Opt., while the rest are in the Indic. This is especially noticeable in similes, as—

Il. 2. 147 ὥς δ' ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺ λήϊον ἐλθὼν,
λαβρὸς ἐπαιγίζων, ἐπὶ τ' ἡμύνει ἀσταχέεσσι.

4. 483 ἦ ῥά τ' ἐν εἰαμενῇ ἔλεος μέγαλοιο πεφύκη
λείη, ἀτάρ τέ οἱ ὄζοι ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῃ πεφύασι.

Successive Relative Clauses not connected by a Conjunction are frequent in Homer. The Relative may be repeated for the sake of emphasis: Od. 2. 130 δόμων ἀέκουσαν ἀπῶσαι ἦ μ' ἔτεχ' ἦ μ' ἔθρεψε. Or the second Clause is epexegetic of the first: as—

Il. 5. 403 σχῆτλιος, ὀβριμοεργός, δς οὐκ ὀθετ' αἴσულᾳ ῥέζων,
δς τόξοισιν ἔκηδε θεούς (so 6. 131., 17. 674, &c.).

Or it marks the return to the main thread of the narrative: as—

Od. 14. 288 δὴ τότε Φοῖνιξ ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ, ἀπατήλια εἰδώς,
τρώκτης, δς δὴ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἑώργει,
ὅς μ' ἄγε παρπεπιθὼν κτλ. (cp. Il. 15. 461–3).

Where different Pronouns are used as Relatives in successive Clauses, the reason of the variety may often be traced. Thus in Il. 16. 157 οἱ δὲ λύκοι ὡς ὠμοφάγοι, τοῖσιν τε περὶ φρεσὶν ἀσπετος ἀλήκῃ, οἳ τ' ἔλαφον . . δάπτουσιν, the Art. τοῖσι gives a characteristic of *all* wolves, the Rel. οἳ passes to *the* wolves of the particular simile. In both the meaning is general, accordingly τε is used.

Again, we find ὅς τε introducing a general assertion, while ὅς

relates to a particular fact: as Π. 4. 442 ἡ τ' ὀλίγη μὲν πρῶτα κορύσσεται . . ἡ σφιν καὶ τότε κτλ. ; 5. 545 Ἀλφειοῦ, ὅς τ' εὐρὺν ῥέει Πυλίων διὰ γαίης, ὅς τέκετ' Ὀρσίλοχον: and in the reverse order, Π. 18. 520 οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἔκανον ὅθι σφίσιν εἶκε λοχῆσαι ἐν ποταμῷ, ὅθι τ' ἀρδμὸς ἔην.

The difference between ὅς τις and ὅς τε appears in Od. 6. 286 καὶ δ' ἄλλη νεμεσῶ ἡ τις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι, ἡ τ' ἀέκητι φίλων πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς ἐόντων ἀνδράσι μίσσηται. Here ἡ τις insists on the inclusion of all members of the class (*any one who*—), ἡ τε prepares us for the class characteristics (*one of the kind that*—).

CHAPTER XII.

USES OF THE MOODS.

Introductory.

273.] **Classification of Sentences.** Before entering upon an examination of the Homeric uses of the Moods, it will be convenient to give some account of the different kinds of Sentences and Clauses with which we shall have to deal.

A Simple Sentence—or the principal Clause in a Complex Sentence—may be purely *Affirmative*. Or, the affirmation may be turned (either by the use of a suitable Pronoun or Particle, or by the tone and manner in which it is uttered) into a question: *i. e.* the Sentence may be *Interrogative*. Or, a predication may be framed in order to be denied: in which case a Particle is added to make the Sentence *Negative*. Or, the Sentence may express *Wish*, *Purpose*, or *Command*; and any of these may again be combined with a Negative, so as to express some variety of *Prohibition*. Or, once more, the Sentence may be *Conditional*, *i. e.* may assert, deny, command, &c. subject to a hypothesis; and this hypothesis or condition may be expressed by a subordinate Clause, or by an Adverb or adverbial phrase (*then, in that case, or the like*): or the condition need not be expressed at all, but conveyed by the drift of the context.

A subordinate Clause may be so loosely connected with the principal Clause as to be virtually an independent sentence. We have seen that this is generally the case (for example) with Clauses introduced by the Article (§ 262). The Clauses which chiefly concern us now are—

1. Dependent Interrogative Clauses.

2. Prohibitive Clauses (μή = *lest*).
3. Relative Clauses proper (introduced by ὅς).
4. Clauses introduced by a Relativial Adverb (ὡς, ὅθι, ὅθεν, ὅτε, ἕως, ὅφρα, &c. ; also ἐνθα, ἵνα, and ἐπει).
5. Clauses introduced by εἰ *if*.

This classification is based upon the grammatical *form* of the Clause. If we look to the relation in point of *meaning* between the two Clauses of a Complex Sentence, we find that subordinate Clauses fall into a wholly different set of groups. Thus there are—

- (1) Clauses expressing *cause* or *reason*: as—

Il. 2. 274 νῦν δὲ τόδε μέγ' ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν,
ὅς τὸν λωβητήρα ἐπεσβόλον ἔσχ' ἀγοράων.

And clauses like Il. 4. 157 ὥς σ' ἔβαλον Τρῶες *since the Trojans have thus shot at you*; 6. 166 οἷον ἄκουσε *at hearing such a thing* (§ 267, 3): as well as in the regular Causal use of ὅ, ὅτι, ὅ τε (§ 269), and οὐνεκα.

- (2) Clauses expressing the *Object* of Verbs of *saying, knowing, thinking, &c.* (*i. e.* the *fact* or *thing* said, &c.): as—

Il. 2. 365 γνώσῃ ἔπειθ' ὅς θ' ἡγεμόνων κακός, ὅς τέ νυ λαῶν.

Od. 6. 141 ὁ δὲ μερμήριζεν Ὀδυσσεὺς | ἦ . . ἦ κτλ.

Il. 18. 125 γνοῖεν δ' ὡς δὴ δηρὸν ἐγὼ πολέμοιο πέπαυμαι.

601 πειρήσεται αἶ κε θέησω (*tries if it will run*).

- (3) Clauses expressing *condition* or *limitation*; which may be introduced—

By ὅς: as τῶν οἱ νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσι *of the mortals now living*: ὅς κ' ἐπιδευής *he who is in want*: ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπείθεται *he who shall obey the gods*: ὅ τι οἱ εἴσαιο *whatever seemed to him*.

By a Relativial Adverb: of *manner*, as ὡς ἐπιτέλλω *as I bid*, ὡς ἂν ἐγὼν εἴπω *as I shall speak*; of *time*, ἐπεί, ὅτε, &c., also ἕως and ὅφρα when they mean *so long as*; of *place*, as ὅπποθι πῖστατον πέδον *where is the richest of the plain*.

By εἰ—the common form of Conditional protasis.

It will be convenient to term all these Clauses 'Conditional'—the word being taken in a wide sense, so as to include every Clause of the nature of a *definition* or *limitation*, as well as those in which actual *priority* in time is implied.

- (4) Final Clauses, expressing *end* or *purpose*: introduced—

By ὅς; as Il. 4. 190 ἐπιθήσει φάρμαχ' ἃ κεν παύσῃσι *will apply drugs which shall stay*: Il. 14. 107 νῦν δ' εἴη ὅς . . ἐνίσποι *may there be one who may tell*.

By ὡς, ὅπως, ἵνα—the ordinary forms expressing purpose.

By *ἕως* (better written *ἦος* in Homer*) and *ἕφα*, when they mean *till such time that*. To these we may add *εἰς ὃ until*, which (like *ὄυνεκα*) is practically a single word.

By *εἰ* or *αἶ*: as *Il. i. 420* *εἴμ' αὐτῇ . . αἶ κε πίθηται* *I go in the hope that he will listen*.

By *μή* *lest* (= *ἵνα μή*).

It is important to observe that the several groups of Clauses now pointed out are generally indistinguishable in respect of grammatical form; so that Clauses of the same form (introduced by the same Pronoun or Particle, and with a Verb of the same Tense and Mood) often bear entirely different meanings. This will be shown in detail in the course of the present chapter; meanwhile a few instances may be noted as illustrations.

1. Final Clauses introduced by *ὅς* are in the same form as the Conditional or limiting Clauses such as *ὅς κε τύχη, ὅττι κεν εἴπῃς, &c.*

2. The regular Final Clauses with *ὥς* and *ὅπως* are in the same form as the limiting *ὥς ἂν ἐγὼν εἴπω* as *I shall speak, ὅπως ἐθέλῃσιν* as *he pleases, &c.*

3. Clauses with *ἕως* and *ἕφα* may either be Conditional (when the Conjunction means *so long as*), or Final (when it means *until*).

4. The Final Clause with *εἰ* is indistinguishable in form from the ordinary Conditional Protasis: compare *αἶ κε πίθηται* to see if he will listen with *Il. 24. 592* *μή μοι Πάτροκλε σκυδμανέμεν αἶ κε πύθηται* *be not angry in case you hear*.

5. Clauses with *μή* may either be Final (when *μή* = *ἵνα μή*), or Object-Clauses after a Verb of *fearing* (*δεῖδω μή*).

From these examples it is evident that in this as in so many parts of Greek grammar the most important differences of meaning are not expressed by corresponding distinctions of form. The Pronoun or Conjunction which connects the subordinate with the principal Clause generally leaves the real relation between the two Clauses to be gathered from the context.

These different kinds of Sentence are distinguished to some extent by means of Particles, of which it will be enough to say here that—

(1) Strong *Affirmation* is expressed by *ἦ*, and the same Particle is employed in *Interrogation* (especially with ironical force).

(2) *Negation* is expressed by *οὐκ* (*οὐκ, οὐ*), *Prohibition* by *μή*.

(3) The Particle *εἰ*, in its ordinary use, marks a *Conditional Protasis, i.e.* a Clause stating a condition or supposition.

(4) The Particles *κε(ν)* and *ἄν* mark a predication as being *Conditional*, or made in view of some *limitation* to particular conditions or circumstances.

* It is often convenient to use the Attic form *ἕως* as the name of the Particle, but this cannot be the true Homeric form. The metre shows that it must be a trochee; and the Doric *ἕς* (Ahrens, *Dial. Dor.* p. 200) represents contraction of *ἕος*: cp. the Cretan *ῥάως* for *ῥέως* (Hesych.). Hence we should have in Homer either *ἦος* (the older Ionic form, cp. *νῆός*) or *ἕος*, which would properly be Doric or Æolic, like *ἁός* &c. Of these *ἦος* is evidently the more probable.

The Subjunctive—in Principal Clauses.

274.] The Subjunctive in a Simple Sentence, or in the Principal Clause of a Complex Sentence, may be said in general to express either the *will* of the speaker or his sense of the *necessity* of a future event. Like the English *must* and *shall*, by which it may usually be rendered, it is intermediate in meaning between an Imperative and a Future. Sometimes (as in *ἵομεν let us go*, or in Prohibitions with *μή*) it is virtually Imperative; sometimes it is an emphatic or passionate Future. These varieties of use will be best understood if treated with reference to the different kinds of sentence—Affirmative, Interrogative, Negative, Prohibitive, &c.—in which they occur.

275.] In *Affirmative* sentences the force of the Subj. depends in great measure on the Person used.

(a) In the First Person the Subj. supplies the place of an Imperative, so far as such a thing is conceivable: that is, it expresses what the speaker *resolves* or *insists* upon doing; e.g.—

Il. 9. 121 ὑμῖν δ' ἐν πάντεσσι περικλυτὰ δῶρ' ὀνομήνω
(where the list of gifts immediately follows).

Od. 2. 222 σῆμά τέ οἱ χεύω καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερεῖξω
πολλὰ μάλ' ὅσσα ἔοικε, καὶ ἀνέρι μητέρα δώσω
(the Subj. expresses the decisive action to be taken by Telemachus, viz. to acknowledge his father's death: the Fut. δώσω expresses what would follow as a matter of course).

12. 383 δύσομαι εἰς Ἀἶδα καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσι φαείνω
(said by way of a threat).

Hence after a Clause containing an Imperative the Subj. is used to show what the speaker will do *as his part* of what he desires to be done: as—

Il. 6. 340 ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐπιμεινον, ἀρήϊα τεύχεα δύνω
do you wait, and I will put on my armour.

22. 416 σχέσθε, φίλοι, καὶ μ' οἶον ἑάσατε κηδόμενοί περ
ἐξελθόντα πόληος ἰκέσθ' ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν,
λίσσωμ' ἀνέρα τοῦτον κτλ.

450 δεῦτε, δύνω μοι ἔπεσθον, ἴδωμ' ὅτιν' ἔργα τέτυκται.

So after the phrases ἀλλ' ἄγε, εἰ δ' ἄγε, as Od. 6. 126 ἀλλ' ἄγ' ἐγὼν αὐτὸς πειρήσομαι ἢ δὲ ἴδωμαι: 9. 37 εἰ δ' ἄγε τοι καὶ νόστον ἔμδον πολυκῆδ' ἐνίσπω. On the phrase εἰ δ' ἄγε see § 321.

To show that a purpose is *conditional* upon something else being done, the Subj. may be qualified by the Particle *κε(ν)*:

Il. 1. 137 εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώωσιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι
if they do not give her, I will (in that case) &c.

II. 14. 235 πείθευ, ἐγὼ δὲ κέ τοι εἰδέω χάριν
obey, and I will feel thankfulness.

16. 129 δύσσοο τεύχεα θάσσοι, ἐγὼ δὲ κε λαὸν ἀγείρω.

Od. 17. 417 τῷ σε χρὴ δόμεναι καὶ λώϊον ἢ περ ἄλλοι
 σίτου· ἐγὼ δὲ κέ σε κλείω κτλ.

So too II. 1. 183 τὴν μὲν . . πέμψω, ἐγὼ δὲ κ' ἄγω Βρισηίδα *I will send her* (as required), *and then I will take Briseis*—the Subj. expressing the speaker's own threatened action, and *κεν* marking that it is the counterpart to what is imposed upon him. It will be found that *κεν* is used when the Clause with the Subj. is introduced by *δέ*, but not when it follows without a connecting Particle. *I.e.* it is when the two Clauses are set *against* one another by *δέ* that it becomes necessary to express also the *conditional* nature of the second Clause.

This use of *κεν* with the Subj. is not found except in Homer.

The First Person Plural is similarly used, as Od. 3. 17 ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἰθὺς κίε Νέστορος ἱπποδάμοιο· εἶδομεν κτλ. And so in the common Hortatory Subj., as φεύγωμεν *let us fly*.

(δ) A Subj. of the Second and Third Person in an Affirmative sentence is usually an emphatic Future, sometimes approaching the force of an Imperative. The only example of a *pure* Subj. (*i.e.* without *κεν* or *ἄν*) in this use appears to be the phrase καὶ ποτέ τις εἴησι *and men shall say* (II. 6. 459, 479., 7. 87).

With *ἄν* we find—

II. 1. 205 ἥς ὑπεροπλήσει τάχ' ἄν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλῃται
 (in effect a threat of what the speaker will do).

22. 505 νῦν δ' ἄν πολλὰ πάθῃσι φίλου ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἁμαρτῶν
but now he must suffer much &c.

With *κεν* the examples are rather more numerous:—

Od. 1. 396 τῶν κέν τις τόδ' ἔχησι, ἐπεὶ θάνε διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς
let one of them have this (emphatic assent).

4. 80 ἀνδρῶν δ' ἣ κέν τις μοι ἐρίσσειται ἢ καὶ οὐκί.

4. 391 καὶ δὲ κέ τοι εἴησι κτλ.

10. 507 ἦσθαι, τὴν δὲ κέ τοι πνοιῇ Βορέας φέρῃσι
sit still, and her the breath of Boreas shall bear along (solemn prophetic assurance).

II. 9. 701 ἀλλ' ἢ τοι κείνον μὲν ἐάσομεν, ἢ κεν ἴησι
 ἢ κε μένῃ (*let him go or let him stay*): cp. Od. 14. 183.

Note that where two alternatives are not expressed by the same Mood, the Subj. gives the alternative on which the stress is laid :

II. 11. 431 σήμερον ἢ δοιοῖσιν ἐπεύξαι . .
 ἢ κεν ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυπείς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσης.

Il. 18. 308 *στήσομαι, ἥ κε φέρῃσι μέγα κράτος ἥ κε φεροίμην*
I shall stand firm, let him gain the victory (= though
he shall gain) or I may gain it.

Od. 4. 692 *ἄλλον κ' ἐχθαίρησι βροτῶν, ἄλλον κε φιλοίῃ*
a king will (is sure to) hate one, he may love another.

A curious combination of Opt. and Subj. is found in—

Il. 24. 654 *αὐτίκ' ἂν ἐξείποι Ἀγαμέμνονι, ποιμένι λαῶν,*
καὶ κεν ἀνάβλησις λύσιος νεκροῖο γένηται
he would straightway tell Agamemnon, and then there must be a
delay in the ransoming of the dead. The Subj. appears to express
the certainty of the further consequence, as though the hypo-
thetical case (αὐτίκ' ἂν ἐξείποι) had actually occurred.

276.] In *Negative Clauses* properly so called (*i. e.* distinguished from Prohibitions) the Subj. is an emphatic Future. We find—

(a) The pure Subj. (expressing a general denial):—

Il. 1. 262 *οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἴδον ἀνέρας οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι*
I have not seen—I never shall see.

7. 197 *οὐ γάρ τις με βίῃ γε ἐκὼν ἀέκοντα διήται*
no man shall chase me against my will.

15. 349 *οὐδέ νυ τόν γε*
γνωτοί τε γνωταί τε πυρὸς λελάχωσι θανόντα.

Od. 16. 437 *οὐκ ἔσθ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ οὐδ' ἔσσεται οὐδὲ γένηται*
there is not, there never will or can be, the man
who, &c. (so 6. 201).

24. 29 *μοῖρ' ὁλόη, τὴν οὐ τις ἀλένεται* (cp. 14. 400).

(b) The Subj. with *ἂν*:—

Il. 3. 54 *οὐκ ἂν τοι χαλίσμῃ κίθαρις κτλ.*
be sure that then your lyre will not avail you.

11. 386 *εἰ μὲν δὴ ἀντίβιον σὺν τεύχεσι πειρηθείης,*
οὐκ ἂν τοι χαλίσμῃσι βιὸς κτλ.

The reason for *ἂν* in these places is obvious: in the following instances it seems to be used because there is a *contrast*:—

Il. 2. 488 *πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω*
but the multitude I cannot declare or tell by name.

Od. 6. 221 *ἄντην δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγωγε λοέσσομαι* (*ἄντην* is emphatic:
 cp. Od. 4. 240., 11. 328, 517).

277.] In *Interrogative sentences* the Subj. generally expresses *necessity*, submission to some command or power; as Il. 10. 62 *αὐθι μένω . . ἥε θέω κτλ.* *am I to remain here, or am I to run &c. ;* Od. 15. 509 *πῇ γὰρ ἐγώ, φίλε τέκνον, ἴω ; τεῦ δώμαθ' ἵκωμαι κτλ.* *where am I to go? to whose house &c. ;* Od. 5. 465 *ὦ μοι ἐγώ, τί*

πάθω ; τί νύ μοι μήκιστα γένηται ; *what am I to suffer ? what is to become of me ?* And rhetorically, with an implied negation —

II. 18. 188 πῶς τ' ἄρ' ἴω μετὰ μῶλον ; ἔχουσι δὲ τεύχε' ἐκείνοι
how can I go into the battle ? They have my arms.

II. 1. 150 πῶς τίς τοι πρόφρων ἔπεσιν πείθεται Ἀχαιῶν ;

One or two passages given by Delbrück under this head should perhaps be classed as Subordinate Clauses. A transitional instance may be seen in Od. 22. 166 σὺ δέ μοι νημερτὲς ἐνίσπες, ἥ μιν ἀποκτείνω . . ἦε σοὶ ἐνθάδ' ἄγω κτλ. *tell me, am I to kill him, or bring him here ?* Here the Clause may be a distinct sentence ; but not so II. 9. 618 ἅμα δ' ἡοὶ φαινομένηφιν φρασσόμεθ' ἥ κε νεώμεθ' κτλ., because this does not express an actual but an intended future deliberation. So in Od. 16. 73 μητρὶ δ' ἐμῇ δίχα θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμηρίζει ἢ αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐμοὶ τε μένη κτλ. the form of expression is changed from the First to the Third Person, as in *oratio obliqua* (§ 280).

278.] With the *Prohibitive* Particle μή the Subj. has the character of an Imperative. We may distinguish however—

(a) Direct forbidding, usually with the First Person Plural (answering to the Hortatory Subj.), and the Second Person Sing.; sometimes also with the Third Person, as—

II. 4. 37 ἔρξον ὅπως ἐθέλεις· μὴ τοῦτό γε νεῖκος ὀπίσσω
σοὶ καὶ ἐμοὶ μέγ' ἔρισμα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισι γένηται
I do not want this to become a quarrel.

Od. 22. 213 Μέντορ, μὴ σ' ἐπέεσσι παραιπεπίθῃσιν Ὀδυσσεύς
see that Ulysses does not persuade you.

And with the First Person Sing., as II. 1. 26 μὴ σε κίχλω *let me not catch you* ; II. 21. 475 μὴ σεῦ ἀκούσω.

(b) Fear, warning, suggestion of danger, &c. ; e.g.—

II. 2. 195 μὴ τι χολωσάμενος ῥέξῃ (*I fear he will &c.*).

· 5. 487 μὴ πως ὥς ἀψῖσι λίνου ἀλόντε πανάγρου
ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένησθε
see that you do not become a prey &c.

22. 123 μὴ μιν ἐγὼ μὲν ἴκωμαι ἰών, ὃ δέ μ' οὐκ ἐλεήσει.

Od. 5. 356 ὦ μοι ἐγώ, μὴ τίς μοι ὑφαλίησιν δόλον αὐτε
ἀθανάτων (*I hope some god is not weaving &c.*).

18. 334 μὴ τίς τοι τάχα Ἴρου ἀμείνων ἄλλος ἀναστῇ
see that a better than Irus does not rise up.

The construction is the same in principle when a Clause of this kind follows a Verb of *fearing* ; and it is sometimes a question whether the Clause is subordinate or not. Thus the older editors (including Wolf) punctuated II. 11. 470 δεῖδω, μὴ τι πάθῃ—as though δεῖδω were parenthetical. It is

probable, however, that in such cases the Clause with μή has acquired a subordinate character, serving as Object to the Verb (*thing feared*) ; see § 281.

On the other hand, the Clauses now in question are often explained by supposing an ellipse of a Verb of *fearing* : μή βέξῃ for δέιδω μή βέξῃ. This is open to the objection that it separates Clauses which are essentially similar. For μή βέξῃ *I will not have him do* (hence *I fear he may do*) is identical in form with μή βέξῃς *I will not have you do*. In this case, then, we have the simple Sentence μή βέξῃ, as well as the Compound δέιδω μή βέξῃ, into which it entered.

Similar questions may arise regarding Final Clauses with μή. Thus in Il. 1. 586-7 τέτλαθι, μήτ' ἐμή, . . . μή σε . . . ἴδωμαι we may translate *endure, mother ; let me not see you &c.*, or (bringing the two Clauses more closely together) *endure, lest I see you &c.* So in Il. 8. 522, Od. 13. 208. No clear line can be drawn between independent and subordinate Clauses : for the complex Sentence has been formed gradually, by the agglutination of the simple Clauses.

The combination μή οὐ—prohibition of a negative—is extremely rare in Homer. In Il. 5. 233 μή τὼ μὲν δέισαντε ματή-σέτου οὐδ' ἐθέλητον, and Il. 16. 128 μή δὴ νῆας ἔλωσι καὶ οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλονται, the Particles are in distinct Clauses. It occurs in a Final Clause, Il. 1. 28 μή νύ τοι οὐ χραίσμη κτλ., Il. 24. 569 : and after δέιδω in Il. 10. 39 δέιδω μή οὐ τίς τοι κτλ.

The Subj. in this use does not take κεν or ἄν, the prohibition being always regarded as unconditional.

It is well known that the *Present* Subj. is not used as an Imperative of Prohibition (with μή). The rule is absolute in Homer for the Second Person. The Third Person is occasionally used when *fear* (not *command*) is expressed ; the instances are,—Od. 5. 356 (quoted above) ; 15. 19 μή νύ τι . . . φέρεται ; 16. 87 μή μιν κετομέωσιν. The restriction does not apply to the First Person Plur., as Il. 13. 292 μηκέτι ταῦτα λεγόμεθα. We shall see that a corresponding rule forbids or restricts the use of μή with the Aorist Imperative (§ 327).

279.] **Homeric and Attic uses.** In Attic the use of the Subj. in independent Clauses is either Hortatory, or Deliberative, or Prohibitive. Thus the use with ἄν (§ 275, a), the use in *Affirmation* (§ 275, b), and the *Negative* uses (§ 276) do not survive.

The Subjunctive in Subordinate Clauses.

280.] **Clauses with ἤέ—ἤε.** Doubt or deliberation between alternative courses of action is expressed by Clauses of the form ἤέ (ἦ)—ἤε (ἦ) with the Subj., dependent on a Verb such as φράσμαι, μερμηρίζω, &c., or an equivalent phrase : *e.g.*—

Il. 4. 14. ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζόμεθ' ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα,
ἢ ῥ' αὖτις πόλεμόν τε κακὸν καὶ φύλοπιν αἰνὴν
ὀρσομεν, ἢ φιλότῃτα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισι βάλλωμεν.

Od. 19. 524 ὥς καὶ ἐμοὶ δίχα θυμὸς δρῶρεται ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα,
ἢ ἐμένω . . . ἢ ἦδη ἄμ' ἔπωμαι κτλ. (cp. 22. 167).

This form is also found (but rarely) expressing, not the speaker's own deliberation, but that of a third person:—

Od. 16. 73 μητρὶ δ' ἐμῇ δίχῃ θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμηρίζει,
ἣ αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐμοὶ τε μένῃ καὶ δῶμα κομίζῃ, κτλ.

The speaker (Telemachus) here expresses himself from his mother's point of view, only putting the Third Person for the First.

So of doubt as to which of two possible results of the speaker's action will be realised:—

Il. 13. 327 εἶδομεν, ἥε τῷ εὖχος ὀρέξομεν, ἥε τις ἡμῖν.

16. 243 εἴσεται ἢ ῥα καὶ οἷος ἐπίσσηται πολεμίζων
ἡμέτερος θεράπων, ἢ οἱ κτλ.

where ἐπίσσηται (*is to know*, = *will prove to know*) is used nearly as the Latin Subj. in Indirect Questions.* An example after a *Past Tense* is found in Il. 16. 646 ff.; see § 298 *fin.*

281.] Clauses with μή. These are mainly of two kinds —

(1) Final Clauses: the Verb of the principal Clause being—

(a) an Imperative, or equivalent form: as—

Il. 3. 414 μή μ' ἔρεθε, σχετλίη, μή χωσαμένη σε μεθείω.

(b) a Present or Future in the First Person: as—

Od. 6. 273 τῶν ἀλεείνω φῆμιν ἀδευκέα, μή τις ὀπίσσω
μωμεύῃ.

In these places the governing Verb shows that the purpose expressed is the speaker's own. The only instance of a different kind is—

Il. 13. 648 ἂψ δ' ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ' ἀλεείνων,
πάντοσε παπταίνων, μή τις χροά χαλκῷ ἐπαύρῃ.

Here (if the reading ἐπαύρῃ is right) the poet describes the fear as though it were present to himself (see however § 298 *fin.*).

The two groups of Clauses under discussion agree in using only the *pure* Subj. (not the Subj. with *κεν* or *ἄν*). In this respect they adhere to the form of the Simple Prohibitive Clause (§ 278).

(2) Clauses following a Verb that expresses the *fear* of the speaker, as δεῖδω μή τι πάθῃσι *I fear that he will suffer*. Here the Clause with μή, although of the same form as the independent Clauses given in § 278, is practically subordinate, and serves as *Object* to the Verb. The Verb, it is to be observed, is always in a Present Tense, and in the First Person: *i.e.* it is the speaker's *own present* fear that is expressed.

* It is impossible to agree with the scholars who explain ἐπίσσηται here as an Indicative; see G. Meyer, *G. G.* § 485.

Such a Clause may be Object to a Verb of *knowing*, &c., as—

Il. 10. 100 δυσμενέες δ' ἄνδρες σχεδὸν ἦται, οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν
μή πως καὶ διὰ νύκτα μενοιρήσῃσι μάχεσθαι.

The fear expressed by *μή πως* κτλ. is subordinated (or on the way to be subordinated) to ἴδμεν: *we do not know* (said apprehensively) *whether they will not be eager &c.* So Od. 24. 491 ἐξελθὼν τις ἴδοι μὴ δὴ σχεδὸν ὧσι κίοντες *some one go out and look whether they are not near.* And in the Prohibitive use—

Il. 5. 411 φραζέσθω μή τίς οἱ ἀμείνων σείῃ μάχηται,
μή δὴν κτλ. *let him see to it that no one &c., lest &c.*

Od. 22. 367 εἰπέ δὲ πατρί μή με περισθενέων δηλήσεται.

So with a Verb of *swearing*, Od. 12. 298 ὁμόσσετε μή πού τις . . ἀποκτάνῃ *swear that no one shall slay*: Od. 18. 55.

282.] **Relative Clauses.** These fall into the two groups of Final Clauses and Conditional or limiting Clauses.

The **Relative Clauses** called Final in the strict sense of the word are those which follow a Clause expressive of *will*; and the reference to the future is shown in most cases by *κεν*: *e. g.*—

Il. 9. 165 ἀλλ' ἄγετε κλητοὺς δτρύνομεν, οἳ κε τάχιστα
ἔλθωσ' ἐς κλισίην.

24. 119 δῶρα δ' Ἀχιλλῆϊ φερέμεν τά κε θυμὸν ἰήνῃ.

Od. 13. 399 ἀμφὶ δὲ λαΐφος
ἔσσω, ὃ κε στυγέσιν ἰδὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔχοντα.

19. 403 ὄνομ' εὔρεο ὅττι κε θῆαι.

With ellipse of the antecedent, so that the Clause supplies an Object to the governing Verb—

Il. 7. 171 κλήρῳ νῦν πεπάλασθε διαμπερὲς ὅς κε λάχῃσι.

In other instances the notion of *End* is less distinctly conveyed, so that the Subj. need only have the emphatic Future meaning (§ 275, *b*): as—

Il. 21. 126 μέλαιναν φρέϊχ' ὑπαίξει
ἰχθύς, ὃς κε φάγῃσι Λυκάονος ἀργέτα δημόν.

Od. 10. 538 ἔνθα τοι αὐτίκα μάντις ἐλεύσεται, ὄρχαμε λαῶν,
ὃς κέν τοι εἴπῃσι κτλ. (so 4. 389, 756., 11. 135).

The prophetic tone prevails in these places: cp. Il. 8. 33 ἀλλ' ἔμπης Δαναῶν ὀλοφυρόμεθ' αἰχμητῶν, οἳ κεν δὴ . . ὀλῶνται, where the Subj. is used as in an independent sentence.

The chief examples of a *pure* Subj. in a Final Clause are—

Il. 3. 286 τιμὴν δ' Ἀργείοις ἀποτινέμεν ἣν τιν' ἔοικεν,
ἣ τε καὶ ἔσσομένοισι μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέληται.

Od. 18. 334 μή τίς τοι τάχα Ἴρος ἀμείνων ἄλλος ἀναστῇ,
ὃς τίς σ' . . δώματος ἐκπέμψῃσι.

So II. 18. 467 *παρέσσεται οἷά τις . . . θανμάσσεται* (unless this is Fut.): also the *Object* Clause II. 5. 33 *μάρνασθ', ὅπποτέροισι πατήρ Ζεὺς κῦδος δρέξῃ* to fight (out the issue) to which of the two Zeus shall give victory (i. e. till one or other wins). The want of *κεν* or *ἄν* is owing to the *vagueness* of the future event contemplated, i. e. the wish to exclude reference to a particular occasion.

The Relative is sometimes used with the Subj. after a Negative principal Clause—where there is necessarily no *actual* purpose:—

Od. 6. 201 οὐκ ἔσθ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ . . ὅς κεν . . ἱκηται (v. l. ἱκοίτο).

II. 23. 345 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς κέ σ' ἔλῃσι κτλ.

and without *κεν*, II. 21. 103 νῦν δ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς τις θάνατον φύγῃ (v. l. φύγοι). In these places the construction evidently follows that of οὐ and οὐκ ἄν with the Subj. in Simple sentences (οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς φύγῃ = οὐ τις φύγῃ). Otherwise we should have the Opt. (§ 304, b).

The Subj. is quite anomalous in—

Od. 2. 42 οὔτε τιν' ἀγγελίην στρατοῦ ἔκλυον ἐρχομένοιο,
ἦν χ' ὑμῖν σάφα εἶπω, ὅτε πρότερός γε πυθοίμην.

But here the speaker is repeating what has been said in the Third Person (30, 31), and with the regular Opt. (εἴποι, πύθοιτο). He evidently uses εἶπω because εἶπομι does not fit the metre.

It is worth notice that the Relative of purpose with the Subj. is much commoner in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*. Of the group which Delbrück describes as Subjunctives of Will with *κεν*, eleven are from the *Odyssey*, two (II. 9. 166, 24. 119) are from the *Iliad* (*Synt. Forsch.* I. pp. 130–132). In Attic the idiom survives in a few phrases, as ἔχει δ' τι εἶπη (Goodwin, § 65, n. 3).

283.] Conditional Relative Clauses. The numerous Clauses which fall under this heading may be divided again into two classes distinguished by the presence or absence of *κεν* or *ἄν*.

(a) The *pure* Subj. is used when the speaker wishes to avoid reference to particular cases, especially to any *future* occasion or state of things. Hence the governing Verb is generally a Present or Perfect Indicative: examples are—

II. 1. 554 τὰ φράσσαι, ἅσθ' ἐθέλῃσθα (*whatever you choose*).

14. 81 βέλτερον δς φεύγων προφύγῃ κακὸν ἢ ἐάλω.

Od. 8. 546 ἀντὶ κασιγνήτου ξεινός θ' ἱκέτης τε τέτυκται
ἀνέρι δς τ' ὀλίγον περ ἐπιψαύῃ πραπίδεςσι.

In *Similes* this usage is extremely common; as—

II. 5. 5 ἀστέρ' ὀπωρινῷ ἐναλίγκιον, δς τε μάλιστα
λαμπρὸν παμφαίῃσι (3. 62., 5. 138., 10. 185, &c.).

Od. 13. 31 ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ δόρποιο λιλαίεται, ᾧ τε πανῆμαρ
νειὸν ἄν' ἔλκητον βόε οἶνοπε πηκτὸν ἄροτρον.

Where the principal Verb refers to the future, and *κεν* or *ἄν* is not used, the intention is to make the reference quite general and sweeping; *e.g.*—

Od. 20. 334 ἄλλ' ἄγε σὴ τάδε μητρὶ παρεζόμενος κατάλεξον
γῆμασθ' ὅς τις ἄριστος ἀνὴρ καὶ πλείστα πόρρησι.

Forms of the 3 Sing. Plqpf. are sometimes given by the MSS. and older editions in Clauses of this kind: as *πεφύκει* (Il. 4. 483), *ἔστίκει* (Il. 17. 435), &c. These were corrected by Hermann (*Opusc.* ii. 44), reading *πεφύκη*, *ἔστίκη*, &c.: see La Roche on Il. 4. 483.

(b) The Subj. with *κεν* indicates *limitation* to particular circumstances in the future. Hence it is used (with few exceptions) when the governing Verb is a Future, or implies futurity (an Imperative, Subjunctive or Optative): as—

Il. 1. 139 ὁ δέ *κεν* κεχολώσεται ὃν *κεν* ἴκωμαι.

Od. 2. 25 κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μεν, Ἰθακήσιοι, ὅττι *κεν* εἴπω.

• Il. 21. 103 νῦν δ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς τις θάνατον φύγη, ὃν *κε* θεός γε κτλ.

Od. 1. 316 δῶρον δ' ὅττι κέ μοι δοῦναι φίλον ἦτορ ἀνώγη,
αὐτὶς ἀνερχομένῳ δόμεναι (cp. Od. 6. 28).

And after a Verbal in *-τος* expressive of necessity:—

Il. 1. 527 οὐδ' ἀτελεύτητον ὃ *τι* *κεν* κτλ.

3. 65 οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητ' ἐστὶ . . ὅσσα *κεν* κτλ.

The reference to a particular future occasion may be evident from the context: as:—

Od. 6. 158 κείνος δ' αὖ περὶ κῆρι μακάρτατος ἔξοχον ἄλλων,
ὅς κέ σ' ἐέδνοισι βρίσσας οἰκόνδ' ἀγάγηται.

In the following places this rule appears to be violated by *κέ(ν)* being used where the reference is *general*; Il. 1. 218., 3. 279., 6. 228, 229., 9. 313, 510, 615., 11. 409., 14. 416., 16. 621., 17. 99., 19. 167, 228, 260., 21. 24, 484., 23. 322., 24. 335. Od. 4. 196., 7. 33., 8. 32, 586., 10. 22, 74, 328., 14. 126., 15. 21, 55, 70, 345, 422., 19. 564., 20. 295., 21. 313, 345. There is strong reason, however, to believe that in most of these instances the appearance of the Particle is due to alteration of the original text. Of the three forms *κεν*, *κε*, *κ'*, the first is on the whole the most frequent in Homer. But out of the 35 places now in question the form *κεν* only occurs in six (not counting Il. 14. 416 *ὅς* *κεν* ἴδηται, where *κεν* is more than doubtful on account of the *ν*); and these six are all in the Odyssey (8. 586., 15. 21, 55, 345., 20. 295., 21. 313). This can hardly be mere accident, and the obvious explanation is that in most of these places, at least in the Iliad, *ὅς* *κε* and *ὅς* *κ'* have been substituted for *ὅς* *τε* and *ὅς* *τ'*. Thus we should probably read (*e.g.*)—

Il. 1. 218 ὅς *τε* θεοὶ ἐπιπείθονται, μάλα *τ'* ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ.

9. 508 ὅς *μέν* *τ'* αἰδέσεται κόρας Διὸς . .

510 ὅς *δέ* *τ'* ἀνήγεται καὶ *τε* κτλ. (cp. 23. 322).

(instead of the strange correlation *μέν* *τε*—*δέ* *κε*).

The real exceptions are most commonly passages in which a Singular is used after a Plural antecedent: as—

Od. 20. 294 οὐ γὰρ καλὸν ἀτέμβειν οὐδὲ δίκαιον
ξείνους Τηλεμάχου, ὅς κεν τάδε δώμαθ' ἴκηται.

With the change of Number we seem to pass from a general description to a particular instance. So in Od. 15. 345, 422, and perhaps in Il. 3. 279., 6. 228., 16. 621, Od. 7. 33 : see § 362, 6.

(c) The use of ἄν in the Clauses of this kind is very rare. In the two places Il. 8. 10 and 19. 230 the reference to the future is plain. The remaining instance is Od. 21. 293 ὅς τε καὶ ἄλλους βλάπτει, ὃς ἄν κτλ., where there is the change from the Plural to the Singular just noticed.

284.] The Relativ Adverbs. The most important are: the Adverbs of *manner*, ὡς and ὅπως; ἵνα, originally an Adverb of *place* (= *where*); and the Adverbs of *time*, ὅφρα, ἕως (ἥος), εἰς ὃ, ὅτε and ὁπότε, εὐτε, ἤμος. It will be best to take these words separately.

285.] ὡς, ὅπως :

(1) Final Clauses with ὡς or ὅπως and the Subj. generally depend upon an Imperative, or some equivalent phrase, *i. e.* they express the aim or purpose of something which the speaker himself does, or wills to be done : as—

Il. 1. 32 ἀλλ' ἴθι μὴ μ' ἐρέθιζε, σαώτερος ὧς κε νήηαι.

7, 293 ἀγαθὸν καὶ νυκτὶ πιθέσθαι,
ὡς σύ τ' εὐφρήνης πάντας κτλ.

The only instance in which the purpose expressed is not *the speaker's own* is—

Od. 14. 181 τὸν δὲ μνηστῆρες ἀγανοὶ
οἴκαδ' ἰόντα λοχῶσιν, ὅπως ἀπὸ φῦλον ὄληται.

(2) With Verbs that by their own meaning imply aim or purpose a Clause of this kind becomes an *Object Clause*: thus—

Il. 4. 66 πειρᾶν δ' ὧς κε Τρῶες . . ἄρξωσι κτλ. (so Od. 2. 316).

9. 112 φραζώμεσθ' ὧς κέν μιν ἀρессάμενοι πεπύθωμεν.

Od. 1. 76 ἡμεῖς δ' οἶδε περιφραζώμεθα πάντες
νόστον, ὅπως ἔλθῃσι (*how he is to come*).

3. 19 λίσσεσθαι δέ μιν αὐτὸς ὅπως νημερτέα εἴπη
entreat him so that he shall speak (*i. e. to speak*).

Here the Clause expresses the *thing* to be tried, thought about, &c., rather than a consequence of such action.

The purpose is sometimes that of some other person, *e. g.*—

Od. 1. 205 φράσσειται ὧς κε νήηται *he will devise how he is to return* (cp. 2. 368., 14. 329).

Il. 1. 558 τῇ σ' ὅτω κατανεῦσαι ἐτήτυμον ὧς Ἀχιλλῆα
τιμῆσσι, ὁλέσῃσι δὲ κτλ. (*hast nodded to the effect &c.*).

Regarding *κεν* and *ἄν* observe that in Final and Object Clauses after *ὥς* the Subj. with *κεν* is the commonest, occurring 32 times, while the Subj. with *ἄν* and the pure Subj. occur each 8 times. After *ὅπως*, which has a more indefinite meaning (*in some such manner that*), the pure Subj. occurs 7 times, the Subj. with *κεν* twice (Od. 1. 296., 4. 545,—both Object clauses).

(3) In Conditional or limiting Clauses:—

(a) After a Present the Subj. is pure in the phrase *ὅπως ἐθέλῃσι* as he pleases (Od. 1. 349., 6. 189). In Il. 16. 83 *πείθεο δ' ὥς τοι ἐγὼ μύθοις τέλος ἐν φρεσὶ θείω* the pure Subj. indicates that *θείω* is really an unconditional expression of *will*: 'listen to me—I will tell you': cp. the independent sentences such as Il. 6. 340 *ἐπιμεινον, ἀρήϊα τεύχεα δύν* (§ 275, a).

The use of *ὥς* and *ὥς τε* in *similes* belongs to this head: e.g.—

Il. 5. 161 *ὥς δὲ λέων ἐν βοῦσὶ θορῶν ἐξ αὐχένα ἄξῃ κτλ.*

Il. 67 οἱ δ' ὥς τ' ἀμνητῆρες ἐναντίοι ἀλλήλοισιν
ὄγμον ἐλαύνωσιν κτλ.

In this use, as in the corresponding use of the Relative (§ 283), the Subj. is pure, the case supposed being not a particular one actually expected, but a typical or recurring one.

Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* I. p. 161) makes the curious observation that if the simile begins (as in the second instance quoted) with a Demonstrative denoting the subject of the comparison, then the Adverb used is always *ὥς τε*. This rule appears to be without exception.

(b) The Subj. with *ἄν* occurs in the formula *ὥς ἂν ἐγὼν εἴπω περθώμεθα*, which refers to a speech about to follow.

The use of *κεν* in—

Il. 20. 242 *Ζεὺς δ' ἀρετὴν ἀνδρεσσιν ὀφέλλει τε μινύθει τε
ὅπως κεν ἐθέλῃσιν*

is perhaps due to the *contrast* between opposite cases: so with *ὅτε*, § 289, 2, b.

286.] *ἵνα* is used in Final Clauses only. With a Subj. it usually expresses the speaker's own purpose; even in—

Od. 2. 306 *ταῦτα δέ τοι μάλα πάντα τελευτήσουσιν Ἀχαιοί,
νῆα καὶ ἐξαίτους ἐρέτας, ἵνα θάσσον ἱκῇαι*

the meaning is 'I undertake that the Achaeans will do this for you.' Exceptions (out of about 80 instances) are: Il. 1. 203 *ἢ ἵνα ὕβριν ἴδῃ* is it that you may see &c.: Il. 9. 99., 12. 435., 24. 43, Od. 8. 580., 10. 24., 13. 327.

An Object Clause with *ἵνα* is perhaps to be recognised in—

Od. 3. 327 *λίσσεσθαι δέ μιν αὐτὸς ἵνα νημερτὲς ἐνίσπῃ*

if the reading is right. The line may be an incorrect repetition of 3. 19.

The pure Subj. only is used with *ἵνα*, except in Od. 12. 156 *ἵνα εἰδότες ἢ κε θάνωμεν ἢ κεν ἀλευόμενοι θάνατον καὶ κῆρα φύγοιμεν*, where two alternatives are given by the correlative *ἢ κεν—ἢ κεν*: cp. § 275, *b*. But some MSS. have *ἢε θάνωμεν*.

As Mr. Gildersleeve points out (*Am. Jour. of Phil.* iv. 425) *ἵνα* is the only purely final Particle, i. e. the only one which does not limit the *purpose* by the notion of *time* (*ὅφρα, ἕως*) or *manner* (*ὡς, ὅπως*). Hence Clauses with *ἵνα* do not take *κεν* or *ἄν*, because the purpose as such is unconditional.

287.] *ὅφρα* is sometimes Final, sometimes Conditional.

(1) In Final Clauses *ὅφρα* either retains a distinctly *temporal* force—meaning *so long till, till the time when*,—or passes into the general meaning *to the end that*. Thus we have—

(a) *ὅφρα* = *until (as shall be)*, used with *κεν* or *ἄν*, as—

Il. 1. 509 *τόφρα δ' ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι τίθει κράτος, ὅφρ' ἄν Ἀχαιοὶ υἷὸν ἔμδν τίσωσιν, δφέλλωσιν τέ ἐ τιμῇ*.

22. 192 *ἀνιχνεύων θέει ἔμπεδον, ὅφρα κεν εὕρῃ*.

With this meaning the pure Subj. is found in Il. 1. 82 *ἔχει κότον ὅφρα τελέσῃ he keeps his anger until he accomplishes it*—a general reflexion: also in Il. 12. 281 (in a simile).

(b) *ὅφρα* = *to the end that*, used with the pure Subj., rarely with *κεν* or *ἄν*. The transition to this meaning may be seen in—

Il. 6. 258 *ἀλλὰ μὲν, ὅφρα κέ τοι μελιθδέα οἶνον ἐνείκω stay till I bring (=giving me time to bring)*.

(2) Clauses with *ὅφρα* may be classed as Conditional when it means *so long as; e. g.*—

Il. 4. 345 *ἔνθα φίλ' ὀπταλέα κρέα ἔδμεναι . . ὅφρ' ἐθέλητον*.

Od. 2. 123 *τόφρα γὰρ οὖν βίότόν τε τεὸν καὶ κτήματ' ἔδονται, ὅφρα κε κείνη τοῦτον ἔχη νόον*.

The use of *κεν* or *ἄν* in these Clauses is governed by the same rule as with *ὅς*, viz. it is used when the reference is to the future, and is not expressly meant to be general (as Il. 23. 47 *ὅφρα ζωοῖσι μετεῖω*). As to the form *ὅφρ' ἄν μὲν κεν*, see § 363, 4.

In Il. 6. 112 *ἀνέρες ἔστε, φίλοι, μνήσασθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς, ὅφρ' ἄν ἐγὼ βῇω* (cp. 8. 375., 17. 186, Od. 13. 412., 19. 17) the Clause seems to mean *until I go*, i. e. *long enough for me to go*. Delbrück however counts the uses of *ὅφρα* in Il. 6. 112, &c. as Conditional (*Synt. Forsch.* i. p. 170).

288.] *ἕως* (ἦος) and *εἰς* ὃ, used with the Subj., always take *κεν*. The meaning *until*, with implied purpose, is the usual one: as—

Il. 3. 290 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα μαχήσομαι εἵνεκα κούρης
αὐθι μένων, ἥός κε τέλος πολέμοιο κιχέλω.

9. 48 νῶϊ δ’ ἐγὼ Σθένελός τε μαχησόμεθ’ εἰς ὃ κε τέκμαρ
’Ιλίου εὐρώμεν.

The Conditional meaning is only found in the recurring expression εἰς ὃ κ’ αὐτμὴ ἐν στήθεσσι μένη καί μοι φίλα γούνατ’ ὀρώρη (Il. 9. 609., 10. 89) = *so long as I have life*.

289.] ὅτε, ὁπότε :

(1) Clauses with ὅτε and ὁπότε may be counted as Final in a few instances in which the governing Clause contains an expression of *time* :

(a) with the pure Subj.—

Il. 21. 111 ἔσσεται ἡ ἥως ἡ δείλη ἡ μέσον ἡμαρ,
ὁππότε τις καὶ ἐμείοι Ἄρει ἐκ θυμὸν ἔλῃται.

So Il. 19. 336 ἐμὴν ποτιδέμενον αἰεὶ λυγρὴν ἀγγελίην, ὅτ’ ἀποφθιμένοιο πύθηται *waiting for the message when he shall hear &c.*, i. e. ‘waiting for the time when the news shall come that &c.’ Here the clause with ὅτε becomes a kind of Object Clause.

(b) with *κεν* or *ἄν* :—

Il. 4. 164 ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὅτ’ ἄν ποτ’ ὀλώλῃ κτλ. (6. 448).

The use of *ἄν* gives definiteness to the expectation, as though a particular time were contemplated. Cp. also Il. 6. 454 ὅσσον σεῦ (μέλει), ὅτε κέν τις . . . δακρυόεσσας ἀγῃται *as I am concerned for you (in respect of the time) when &c.*, and 8. 373 ἔσται μὰν ὅτ’ ἄν κτλ.

It is obvious that in these places the Clause is not strictly Final, since the Subj. expresses *emphatic prediction* (§ 275, b) rather than purpose. But they have the essential characteristic of Final Clauses, viz. that the time of the Clause is fixed by that of the governing Verb.

(2) Clauses with ὅτε or ὁπότε which define the time of the principal Clause may be regarded as Conditional. In regard to the use of *κεν* and *ἄν* they follow the rules which hold in the case of Conditional Relative Clauses (§ 283) : viz.—

(a) The pure Subj. indicates that the speaker is supposing a case which may occur *repeatedly*, or *at any time* : as—

Od. 7. 71 οἳ μὲν ῥα θεὸν ὧς εἰσορόωντες
δειδέχεται μύθοισιν, ὅτε στείχῃσ’ ἀνὰ ἄστν

who look on him as a god, and salute him when he walks &c.

Il. 1. 163 οὐ μὲν σοί ποτε ἴσον ἔχω γέρας, ὁππότε ’Αχαιοὶ
Τρώων ἐκπέρσωσ’ εὖ ναιόμενον πτολίεθρον

whenever the Greeks sack a Trojan town. So in maxims, &c. :—

Il. 1. 80 κρείστων γὰρ βασιλεὺς ὅτε χάσεται ἀνδρὶ χέρῃ.

Π. 15. 207 ἐσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυκται ὅτ' ἄγγελος αἴσιμα εἶδῃ.
And in similes, as Π. 2. 395 ὅτε κινήσῃ Νότος ἐλθών. So with the regular ὡς ὅτε *as when*, ὡς ὁπότε *as in any case when*.

In a few instances ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν is found instead of ὡς δ' ὅτε : viz.—

Π. 15. 170 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ἐκ νεφέων πτήται κτλ.

19. 375 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ἐκ πόντοιο σέλας ναύτησι φανήῃ

Od. 5. 394 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ἀσπασίος βίοςτος παῖδεςσι φανήῃ

23. 233 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ἀσπασίος γῇ νηχομένοισι φανήῃ

Π. 11. 269 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ὠδίνουσιν ἔχῃ βέλος δὲ γυναικα

17. 520 ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἄν δέξιν ἔχων πέλεκυν κτλ.

Also Π. 10. 5., 24. 480, Od. 22. 468. The resemblance that runs through these instances would seem to indicate some common source of the peculiar ἄν.

In the one or two places where the pure Subj. occurs after a Future there is an evident intention to speak quite generally : as Π. 21. 322 οὐδέ τί μιν χρεῶ ἔσται τυμβοχόης ὅτε μιν θάπτωσιν Ἀχαιοί : so Od. 16. 268., 23. 257. But *κεν* is used in the similar passage Π. 10. 130 οὗ τις νεμεσῆσεται . . ὅτε κέν τιν' ἐποτρύνῃ.

(b) *κεν* or *ἄν* connects a supposition with a *particular* event or state of things : hence it is usually found after a Future, Subjunctive, or Imperative, as—

Π. 4. 53 τὰς διαπέρσαι ὅτ' ἄν τοι ἀπέχθωνται.

Od. 1. 40 ἐκ γὰρ Ὀρέσταις τίσις ἔσσεται Ἀτρεΐδαι
ὁππότ' ἄν ἡβήσῃ τε καὶ ἧς ἱμείρεται αἵης.

Π. 20. 130 δέισετ' ἔπειθ', ὅτε κέν τις κτλ.

Od. 2. 357 ἐσπέριος γὰρ ἐγὼν αἰρήσομαι ὁππότε *κεν* δὴ κτλ.

So after *μοῖρα* (Od. 4. 475), followed by an Inf.

In other places it is not so clear why an event is treated as particular. Perhaps *κεν* or *ἄν* may be used with ὅτε, ὁπότε—

(1) When a *contrast* is made between supposed cases, as—

Π. 6. 224 τῷ νῦν σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ ξείνος φίλος Ἀργεῖ μέσσω
εἰμί, σὺ δ' ἐν Λυκίῃ, ὅτε *κεν* τῶν δῆμον ἴκωμαι.

20. 166 πρῶτον μὲν . . ἀλλ' ὅτε κέν τις κτλ.

Od. 20. 83 ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν καὶ ἀνεκτὸν ἔχει κακόν, ὁππότε κέν τις
κτλ.

11. 17 οὐθ' ὁππότ' ἄν στείλῃσι . . οὐθ' ὅτ' ἄν ἂψ κτλ.

(Here we should read ὁπότε στείλῃσι, § 363, 4).

So perhaps Π. 2. 397 παντοίων ἀνέμων, ὅτ' ἄν ἐνθ' ἡ ἔνθα γένωνται : 9. 101 κρηῖναι δὲ καὶ ἄλλω, ὅτ' ἄν τινα κτλ. and Od. 13. 100 ἐν-
τοσθεν δέ τ' ἄνευ δεσμοῖο μένουσι νῆες ἐϋσσελμοι, ὅτ' ἄν ὄρου
μέτρον ἴκωνται (in contrast to those outside). But cp. the remark
as to ὅτ' ἄν in the last note.

(2) When there is a change from Plural to Singular :—

Π. 9. 501 λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβῇ καὶ ἀμάρτῃ.

Od. 11. 218 ἀλλ' αὐτῇ δίκη ἐστὶ βροτῶν, ὅτε τίς κε θάνησι.

This last instance is doubtful, since the order ὅτε τίς κε is not Homeric (§ 365). We should probably read ὅτε τίς τε.

290.] εὔτε, ἦμος. The word εὔτε is only once found with a pure Subj., viz. Od. 7. 202 (in a general assertion): εὔτ' ἄν occurs after a Future (Il. 1. 242., 19. 158), and an Imperative (Il. 2. 34); also in one or two places where the use of ἄν is more difficult to explain, viz. Il. 2. 227 (read εὔτε πολλέθρον ἔλωμεν), Od. 1. 192., 17. 320, 323., 18. 194. The combination εὔτε κέν is not found.

The pure Subj. with ἦμος occurs in one place—

Od. 4. 400 ἦμος δ' ἥελιος μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβέβηκεν
where the reference is general, 'each midday.'

The Subjunctive with εἰ, &c.

291.] **Clauses with εἰ.** The use of the Particle εἰ (or αἶ), in the Clauses with which we have now to do, is to make an *assumption* or *supposition*. In most cases (1) this assumption is made in order to assert a consequence (εἰ=if): in other words, it is a *condition*. But (2) an assumption may also be made in order to express *end*: εἰμι . . αἶ κε πίθηται *I go—suppose he shall listen*= 'I go in order that if he will listen (he may do so):' accordingly the Clause may be virtually a Final Clause. Again (3) with certain Verbs an assumption may be the Object: *e.g.* τίς οἶδ' εἴ κεν . . ὀρίνω *who knows—suppose I shall rouse*=who knows whether I shall rouse. We shall take these three groups of Clauses in order.

292.] **Conditional Protasis with εἰ.** The chief point of interest under this head is the use of κεν or ἄν. The rules will be found to be essentially the same as those already laid down for the corresponding Clauses with the Relative (§ 283, *b*) and the Relational Adverbs (see esp. § 289, *b*), and to be even more uniform in their application.

(a) The pure Subj. is used in general sayings, and in similes:

Il. 1. 80 κρείσσω γὰρ βασιλεὺς ὅτε χάσεται ἀνδρὶ χέρῃ·
εἴ περ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτήμαρ καταπέψῃ,
ἀλλὰ τε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχει κότον.

12. 238 τῶν οὗ τι μετατρέπομ' οὐδ' ἀλεγίζω,
εἴ τ' ἐπὶ δεξιῇ ἴωσι πρὸς ἡῶ τ' ἡελίων τε,
εἴ τ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ τοί γε κτλ.

Od. 16. 97 κασιγνήτοις . . οἰσί περ ἀνὴρ
μαρναμένοισι πέποιθε καὶ εἰ μέγα νείκος ὄρηται.

- Π. 11. 116 ἢ δ' εἴ περ τε τύχησι κτλ. (so Π. 4. 261., 9. 481., 10. 225., 16. 263., 21. 576., 22. 191, Od. 1. 188., 7. 204., 12. 96., 14. 373.

If the principal Verb is a Future (or implies reference to the future), the pure Subj. with εἴ indicates that the supposed occasion is *indefinite*,—one that happens repeatedly, or at any time, or may not happen at all; so Π. 1. 340 εἴ ποτε δὴ αὐτε χρεῖω ἐμεῖο γένηται κτλ.; 12. 245 εἴ περ γάρ τ' ἄλλοι γε περικτεινόμεθα πάντες κτλ.; Od. 1. 204 οὐδ' εἴ περ τε σιδήρεα δέσματ' ἔχησι. This form is naturally employed by a speaker who does not wish to imply that the occasion will actually arise: thus in—

- Π. 12. 223 ὧς ἡμεῖς εἴ περ τε πύλας καὶ τεῖχος Ἀχαιοὺν
ρήξόμεθα σθένει μεγάλῳ, εἰζώσι δ' Ἀχαιοί,
οὐ κόσμῳ παρὰ ναῦφιν ἐλευσόμεθ' αὐτὰ κέλευθα

Polydamas is interpreting an omen which he wishes to remain unfulfilled. Similarly Π. 5. 248 εἴ γ' οὖν ἑτερός γε φύγησι: Π. 22. 86 εἴ περ γάρ σε κατακτάνῃ, οὐ σ' ἔτ' ἔγωγε κλαύσομαι ἐν λεχέεσσι: Od. 5. 221 εἴ δ' αὖ τις ῥαίησι θεῶν κτλ.: Od. 12. 348 εἴ δὲ χολωσάμενός τι . . νῆ' ἐθέλῃ δλέσαι κτλ. The object of the speaker in these examples is to treat the supposed case as imaginary or unpractical.

(δ) The Subj. with *κεν* or *ἄν* indicates that a particular future occasion is contemplated: hence—

- Π. 4. 353 ὄψεαι ἦν ἐθέλησθα καὶ αἶ κέν τοι τὰ μεμήλη.

11. 404 μέγα μὲν κακὸν (sc. ἔσται) αἶ κε φέβωμαι.

24. 592 μή μοι . . σκυδμαινέμεν, αἶ κε πύθῃαι κτλ.

Od. 2. 218 εἰ μὲν *κεν* πατρὸς βίοντον καὶ νόστον ἀκούσω,
ἢ τ' ἄν τρυχόμενός περ ἔτι τλαίην ἐνιαντόν.

11. 112 εἰ δέ κε σῖνῃαι, τότε τοι τεκμαίρομ' ὄλεθρον
(*I prophesy your destruction*).

So, though the Verb of the governing Clause is a Present—

Π. 6. 442 αἰδέομαι Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας ἐλκεσιπέπλους,
αἶ κε κτλ. (= *I fear what they will think if &c.*).

8. 477 σέθεν δ' ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀλεγίζω
χωομένης, οὐδ' εἴ κε τὰ νείατα πείραθ' ἴκηαι
= *I do not care for you, (and shall not) even if &c.*

Instances of *κεν* or *ἄν* in a sentence of *general* meaning are—

Π. 3. 25 μάλα γάρ τε κατεσθίει, εἴ περ ἄν αὐτὸν
σεύωνται κτλ. (*even in the case when—*, § 363, 1, δ).

11. 391 ἢ τ' ἄλλως ὑπ' ἐμεῖο, καὶ εἴ κ' ὀλίγον περ ἐπαύρη,
ὄξυν βέλος πέλεται.

12. 302 εἴ περ γάρ χ' εὖρησι παρ' αὐτόφει κτλ.

Od. 11. 158

τὸν οὖ πως ἔστι περιῆσαι
πεζὸν ἐόντ', ἣν μή τις ἔχῃ εὐεργέα νῆα.

But with εἰ κε there is the same doubt as with οὕς κε (§ 283), and ἐπεὶ κε (§ 296). As to ἣν, which occurs in a general saying in Il. 1. 166 and Od. 11. 159, see § 362.

293.] Final Clauses with εἰ. After a principal Verb expressive of the speaker's *will* (an Imperative, or First Person), a Final Clause may be introduced by εἰ κεν or ἣν: as—

Il. 8. 282 βάλλ' οὕτως εἰ κέν τι φόως Δαναοῖσι γένηται.

11. 791 ταῦτ' εἴποις Ἀχιλῆϊ δαΐφρονι εἰ κε πίθηται.

Od. 4. 34 δεῦρ' ἰκόμεθ' αἶ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς . . παύσῃ κτλ.

The effect of using εἰ (instead of ὥς or ἵνα) is to express some degree of uncertainty. The end aimed at is represented as a *supposition*, instead of being a direct *purpose*.

In the existing text the pure Subj. occurs only in Il. 14. 165 ἀρίστη φαίνεται βουλή ἐλθεῖν . . εἰ πως ἰμείραιτο . . τῷ δ' . . χεύῃ (where we should perhaps read χεύαι; or change χεύῃ ἐπὶ to χεύειε); and in Od. 5. 471 εἰ δέ κεν . . καταδράθω, εἰ με μεθήῃ ῥίγος καὶ κάματος, γλυκερὸς δέ μοι ὕπνος ἐπέλθῃ, where the MSS. have the Opt. μεθήῃ, ἐπέλθοι. But if ἣν has sometimes crept in instead of εἰ, as is probable (§ 362) there may be other examples: as—

Il. 22. 418 λίσσωμ' ἀνέρα τοῦτον . . ἣν πως κτλ.

Od. 1. 281 ἔρχεο πειυσόμενος πατρὸς δὴν οἰχομένοιο,
ἣν τίς τοι εἴπησι κτλ.

294.] Object Clauses with εἰ. This term will serve to describe the form of Clause in which the supposition made by εἰ takes the place of an Acc. of the thing. It may be regarded as a special form of the Final Clause (cp. § 285, 2): thus Il. 18. 600 ὥς ὅτε τις τροχὸν . . πειρήσεται εἰ κε θέησι 'tries in respect to the supposition that it will run,' hence *tries whether it will run*: so—

Il. 4. 249 ὄφρα ἴδῃτ' εἰ κ' ὕμιν ὑπερσχῇ χεῖρα Κρονίων.

15. 32 ὄφρα ἴδῃ ἣν τοι χαλίσμῃ κτλ.

that you may see whether it will avail. Note that the Subj. here has a distinctly *future* meaning, as in Final Clauses; the same words taken as a Conditional Protasis would mean *if it has availed*. So after εἰπεῖν, Il. 7. 375 καὶ δὲ τόδ' [leg. τὸ] εἰπέμεναι πυκινὸν ἔπος, αἶ κ' ἐθέλωσι *say the word supposing that they shall be willing* (=ask if they will agree), Il. 17. 692 εἰπεῖν, αἶ κε τάχιστα νέκυν ἐπὶ νῆα σαώσῃ; and οἶδα in the phrase τίς οἶδ' εἰ κεν *who knows but* (Il. 15. 403., 16. 860, Od. 2. 332), and οὐ μὰν οἶδ' εἰ (Il. 15. 16).

The use of the *Accusativus de quo* (§ 140, 3) should be noticed ; especially after *οἷδα*, anticipating the Clause with *εἰ* : as—

Il. 8. 535 αὔριον ἦν ἀρετὴν διαείσεται εἰ κ' ἐμὸν ἐγγος
μείνῃ ἐπερχόμενον

meaning 'he will know as to his prowess whether it will enable him to withstand my spear.' So Od. 22. 6 σκοπὸν ἄλλον . . εἴσομαι αἶ κε τύχωμι (cp. § 140, 3, δ).

In one place the Clause with *εἰ* serves as explanation of a Neuter Pronoun in the *Nominative* :

Il. 20. 435 ἀλλ' ἣ τοι μὲν ταῦτα θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κείται,
εἰ κέ σε χειρότερός περ ἐὼν ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἔλωμαι.

295.] The Subj. with ὥς εἰ occurs in a single place only, viz.—

Il. 9. 481 καί με φίλησ' ὥς εἴ τε πατὴρ δὴν παῖδα φιλήσῃ.

Here the assumption *εἰ* . . *φιλήσῃ* is made for the purpose of comparison. Thus the meaning is nearly the same as with *ὥς ὅτε* (§ 289, 2), and the Clause is essentially Conditional.

296.] ἐπεὶ with the Subj. The use of *ἐπεὶ* implies that the action is prior in time to the action of the principal Clause ; hence Clauses with *ἐπεὶ* properly fall under the definition of the Conditional Clause.

A pure Subj. after *ἐπεὶ* is found in four places, one a gnomic passage, Od. 20. 86 ἐπεὶ ἄρ βλέφαρ' ἀμφικαλύψῃ (*sleep makes men forget everything*) when it has spread over their eyelids ; the other three in similes, viz. Il. 11. 478., 15. 363, 680. In Il. 16. 453 the best MSS. give αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τὸν γε λίπη ψυχὴ τε καὶ αἰὼν, πέμπειν μιν κτλ., others ἐπὴν δῆ. The pure Subj. implies that the command is meant to be *general* in form : cp. § 292, a.

κεν or ἄν is invariably used when the principal Verb is future. It is also found after a Present, and even in similes : e.g.—

Il. 2. 474 τοὺς δ' ὥς τ' αἰπόλια πλατέ' αἰγῶν αἰπόλοι ἀνδρες
ρεῖα διακρίνωσιν, ἐπεὶ κε νομῶ μιν γέωσιν.

So ἐπεὶ κε(ν), Il. 7. 410., 9. 324., 21. 575, Od. 8. 554., 11. 221., 24. 7 : and ἐπὴν, Il. 6. 489., 19. 223, Od. 8. 553., 10. 411., 11. 192., 14. 130., 19. 206, 515. In Il. 1. 168 should perhaps be read ἐπεὶ κεκάμω (instead of ἐπεὶ κε κάμω), and so Il. 7. 5 ἐπεὶ κεκάμωσι, and Il. 17. 657 ἐπεὶ ἄρ κεκάμησι.

Regarding *ἐπεὶ κε(ν)* in this use there is the same question as with *ὅς κε* (§ 283). Out of 10 instances there is only one in which the form *κεν* appears, viz. Il. 21. 575 ἐπεὶ κεν ὑλαγμὸν ἀκούσῃ, and there Zenodotus read *κυνυλαγμὸν*, which is strongly supported by the metre (§ 367, 2). Thus there is the same reason as before for supposing that *κε* is often merely a corrup-

tion of *τε*. The use of *ἐπεὶ τε* is sufficiently established in Homer (§ 332).

The form *ἐπὶν* is open to doubt on other grounds, which it will be better to discuss in connexion with other uses of the Particle *ἄν* (§ 362).

297.] *πρίν* with the Subj. In general, as we have seen (§ 236), *πρίν* is construed with an Infinitive. If, however, the event is insisted upon as a *condition*,—the principal Verb being an Imperative or emphatic Future,—the Subj. may be used; as—

Il. 18. 134 ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν μὴ πω καταδύσσοο μῶλον Ἄρηος
πρίν γ' ἐμὲ δεῦρ' ἐλθοῦσαν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδῃαι

do not enter the battle before you see me coming hither.

Od. 10. 174 ὦ φίλοι, οὐ γὰρ πρίν καταδυσόμεθ' ἀχνύμενοί περ
εἰς Αἴδαο δόμους πρίν μόρσιμον ἡμᾶρ ἐπέλθῃ.

So Il. 18. 190., 24. 551, 781, Od. 13. 336., 17. 9. The Subj. is used in these examples without *κεν* or *ἄν*, because it is not meant to lay stress on a particular occasion when the condition will be fulfilled. When such an occasion is contemplated Homer sometimes uses *πρίν γ' ὅτ' ἄν* *before the time when* (Od. 2. 374., 4. 477): cp. Il. 16. 62 οὐ πρίν μῆνιθμον καταπαυσέμεν, ἀλλ' ὅπῳτ' ἄν κτλ. The use of *πρίν ἄν* with the Subj. is post-Homeric.

It is evident that a conditional Clause of this kind can only occur after a *negative* principal Clause. 'Do not do this before I come' makes my coming into a condition, and a condition which may or may not be realised: but 'do this before I come' is merely a way of fixing the time of doing.

This construction is usually explained from Parataxis: thus it is held that in Il. 24. 551 οὐδέ μιν ἀνστήσεις πρίν καὶ κακὸν ἄλλο πάθησθα stands for—

οὐδέ μιν ἀνστήσεις πρίν καὶ κακὸν ἄλλο πάθησθα,

you will not raise him, sooner shall you suffer passing into 'you will not raise him before you suffer.' So Sturm (p. 26), and Goodwin (§ 624). But (1) this use of the Subj. in a Principal clause without *κεν* or *ἄν*, whether as a Future (§ 275, b) or as an Imperative, is not Homeric, and therefore cannot be used to explain a use which is only beginning in Homer. And (2) the change from *you will not raise, you will suffer before you do* to *you will not raise before you suffer* is not an easy one: it involves shifting *πρίν* as an Adverb from one clause to another. Above all (3) it is probable that the new construction of *πρίν* with the Subj. was directly modelled on the existing use with the Inf.: that is to say, *πρίν πάθησθα* simply took the place of *πρίν παθεῖν* when a more definite conditional force was wanted. This is confirmed by the analogy of the later change to the Indic.: thus in Aesch. P. V. 479 πρίν γ' ἐγὼ σφισιν ἔδειξα is used instead of *πρίν ἐμὲ δέξαι* because the poet wishes to make the assertion *ἔδειξα*. So with the transition from the Inf. to the Indic. after ὥστε (Goodwin, § 585): the finite mood is not a survival of parataxis, but is used when the Infinitive is not sufficiently positive.

298.] Subjunctive after a Secondary Tense. The rule in Homer is that the Subj. is not used in a Subordinate Clause to express a *past* purpose, condition, &c. It may be used however (1) when the governing Verb is a 'gnomic' Aorist:—

Il. 1. 218 *ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπείθεται μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ.*

Od. 20. 85 *ὁ γάρ τ' ἐπέλησεν ἀπάντων
ἐσθλῶν ἠδὲ κακῶν, ἐπεὶ ἄρ βλέφαρ' ἀμφικαλύψῃ.*

Or an Aor. used to express a *general* denial, as—

Od. 10. 327 *οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ τις ἄλλος ἀνὴρ τάδε φάρμακ' ἀνέτλη,
ὅς κε πῆρ κτλ. (cp. Od. 12. 66).*

Or in a simile, as Il. 4. 486 *ἐξέταμ', ὄφρα ἴτυν κάμψῃ κτλ.*

Further (2) if the action expressed by the Subordinate Clause is still future at the time of speaking; as—

Il. 5. 127 *ἀχλὺν δ' αὖ τοι ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἔλον ἢ πρὶν ἐπῆεν,
ὄφρ' εὖ γιγνώσκῃς ἡμὲν θεὸν ἠδὲ καὶ ἄνδρα
I have taken away the mist—that you may know &c.*

7. 394 *καὶ δὲ τόδ' ἡρώγει εἰπεῖν ἔπος, αἶ κ' ἐθέλητε κτλ.*

18. 189 *μήτηρ δ' οὐ με φίλη πρὶν γ' εἶα θωρήσσεσθαι
πρὶν γ' αὐτὴν . . ἴδωμαι (before I shall see her &c.).*

Od. 11. 434 *οἱ τε κατ' αἰσχος ἔχευε καὶ ἐσσομένησιν ὀπίσσω
θηλυτέρῃσι γυναιξί, καὶ ἥ κ' εὐεργὸς ἔησι.*

So Il. 9. 99., 20. 126., 24. 781. In these places the governing Verb is generally to be translated by the English Perfect with *have* (cp. § 73).

The real exceptions to this rule are not numerous, and may be due in several cases to alteration of the text through the influence of the later usage. The reading is uncertain (*e.g.*) in—

Od. 14. 327 *τὸν δ' ἐς Δωδώνην φάτο βήμεναι ὄφρα θεοῖο
(= 19. 296) ἐκ δρυὸς ὑψικόμοιο Διὸς βουλὴν ἐπακούσῃ,*
where the Subj. was read by Aristarchus, the Opt. *ἐπακούσαι* by Aristophanes and Herodian. Again in—

Od. 10. 65 *ἡ μὲν σ' ἐνδυκῶς ἀπεπέμπομεν, ὄφρ' ἂν ἱκῃαι*
the best MSS. have *ἱκῃαι*, but others have *ὄφρ' ἂν ἱκοιο* and *ὄφρ' ἀφίκοιο*. See also Il. 15. 23, Od. 15. 300., 22. 98: and cp.—

Il. 5. 567 *μή τι πάθοι, μέγα δέ σφας ἀποσφίλειε*

15. 598 *ἐμβάλοι . . Θέτιδος δ' ἐξαίσιον ἀρὴν
πάσαν ἐπικρήνειε.*

In these places the MSS. generally have *πάθῃ*, *ἐμβάλη*: but the Opt. in the clause following has led the editors to adopt *πάθοι*, *ἐμβάλοι*.

Other places where the Subj. is contrary to the rule now laid down are Il. 13. 649., 14. 165., 16. 650 (see La R.), 19. 354., 24. 586, Od. 9. 102., 10. 24., 16. 369., 17. 60., 22. 467. In all

the Opt. may be substituted without affecting the metre; and when we consider the number of places where the MSS. vary between Subj. and Opt. forms, we can hardly doubt that it would generally be right to make the change.

The Homeric rule is observed by Plato (see Riddell, *Dig.* §§ 90, 91), but not by Attic writers in general.

The Optative in Simple Sentences.

299.] The uses of the Optative in Simple Sentences range from the expression of a wish on the part of the speaker to the expression of mere supposition, or admission of possibility.

Without *κεν* or *ἄν* the Optative may express—

(a) Simple *wish* or *prayer*: as—

Il. 1. 42 *τίσειαν Δαναοὶ ἐμὰ δάκρυα σοῖσι βέλεσσι.*

Od. 1. 403 *μὴ γὰρ ὃ γ' ἔλθοι κτλ. never may he come &c.*

Regarding the Opt. of wish with *εἰ* or *αἶ*, *εἴθε*, *αἴθε*, &c. see § 311.

(b) A gentle or deferential Imperative, conveying *advice*, *suggestion*, or the like: as—

Il. 4. 17 *εἰ δ' αὖ πως τόδε πᾶσι φίλον καὶ ἡδὺ γένοιτο,
ἦ τοι μὲν οἰκέοιτο πόλις Πριάμοιο κτλ.*

(= *I presume the city is to remain inhabited*).

Od. 4. 735 *ἀλλὰ τις ὀτρηνῶς Δολίον καλέσειε γέροντα
(as we say, would some one call &c.).*

18. 141 *τῷ μὴ τίς ποτε πάμπαν ἀνὴρ ἀθεμίστιος εἴη,
ἀλλ' ὃ γε σιγῇ δῶρα θεῶν ἔχοι*

I would have a man not be lawless, but &c.

Note especially this use of the Second Person, as in—

Od. 4. 193 *πίθοιό μοι pray listen to me: so in the formal
phrase ἡ ῥά νύ μοι τι πίθοιο (Il. 4. 93, &c.).*

Il. 11. 791 *ταῦτ' εἵποις Ἀχιλῆϊ surpose you say this to Achilles.*

Od. 15. 24 *ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἔλθων αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψειας ἕκαστα.*

Il. 3. 406 *ἦσο παρ' αὐτὸν ἰούσα, θεῶν δ' ἀπόεικε κελεύθου,
μηδ' ἔτι σοῖσι πόδεσσιν ὑποστρέψειας Ὀλυμπον.*

Hence in Il. 1. 20 we should read (with the best MSS.) *παῖδα δ' ἐμοὶ λύσαιτε* (not *λύσαι τε*, Wolf's conjecture).

(c) Rhetorical wish, implying *willingness*, or *indifference* to the happening of some evil: as in imprecations—

Il. 2. 340 *ἐν πυρὶ δὴ βουλαί τε γενοίατο μήδεα δ' ἀνδρῶν.*

6. 164 *τεθναίης, ᾧ Προῖτ', ἣ κάκτανε Βελλεροφόντην
(= *I care not if you were dead, unless you &c.*).*

Od. 7. 224 *ἰδόντα με καὶ λίποι αἶὼν κτήσιν ἐμὴν κτλ.*

(= *I am content to die when I have seen &c.*).

(d) *Concession* or acquiescence :—

Il. 21. 359 λῆγ' ἔριδος, Τρῶας δὲ καὶ αὐτίκα δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς
ἄσπεος ἐξελάσειε (*cease strife, and I consent that &c.*).

Od. 1. 402 κτήματα δ' αὐτὸς ἔχοις καὶ δώμασι σοῖσιν ἀνάσσοις.

2. 232 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ χαλεπὸς τ' εἴη καὶ αἴσυλα ῥέξοι
(i. e. *he may as well be unjust as just*).

Hes. Op. 270 νῦν δὲ ἐγὼ μῆτ' αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δίκαιος
εἶην μῆτ' ἐμὸς υἱός.

The following are instances of the First Person used in this way :

Il. 15. 45 αὐτὰρ τοι καὶ κείνῳ ἐγὼ παραμυθησάμην
I am willing to advise him (a concession).

So Il. 4. 318 μάλα μὲν τοι ἐγὼν ἐθέλωμι κτλ., but some MSS.
have μὲν κεν.

Il. 23. 150 νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὐ νέομαι γε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν,
Πατρόκλῳ ἥρωϊ κόμην ὀπάσαιμι φέρεσθαι
since I am not to return, I may as well &c.

Od. 16. 383 ἀλλὰ φθέωμεν ἐλόντες ἐπ' ἀγροῦ νόσφι πόλῃος
ἢ ἐν ὁδῷ, βίοτον δ' αὐτοὶ καὶ κτήματ' ἔχωμεν
δασσάμενοι κατὰ μοῖραν ἐφ' ἡμέας, οἰκία δ' αὐτε
κείνου μητέρι δοῖμεν ἔχειν ἢδ' ὅς τις ὄνυλοι.

Here what the Suitors are to do for themselves is put in the Subj., what they do or allow to be done for Penelope in the Opt.

Compare Hdt. 7. 5. 4 τὸ μὲν νῦν ταῦτα πρήσσοις τὰ περ ἐν χερσὶ ἔχεις, ἡμερώσας
δὲ Αἴγυπτον τὴν ἐξυβρίσασαν στρατηλάτεις ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας, i. e. 'I consent to your
doing what you have in hand, but when it is done, march against Athens.'

(e) Strong *denial* is sometimes implied, under the form of *deprecation*, by the Opt. with μή : as—

Od. 7. 316 μὴ τοῦτο φίλον Διὶ πατρὶ γένοιτο *let us not admit
that this is the will of father Zeus.*

22. 462 μὴ μὲν δὴ καθαρῷ θανάτῳ ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἐλοίμην.

(f) *Admission of possibility*, i. e. willingness to *suppose* or believe that the thing will happen. This use is rarely found without κεν or ἄν : an instance is—

Od. 3. 231 ρεῖα θεὸς γ' ἐθέλων καὶ τηλόθεν ἄνδρα σαώσαι.

This is said as a concession : 'we men must allow that a god can save even from afar.' So perhaps Il. 10. 247, 557 : also—

Il. 15. 197 θυγατέρεσσιν γάρ τε καὶ νιάσι βέλτερον εἶη κτλ.

Here the Opt. is in contrast to the preceding Imper. μὴ τί με δειδισσέσθω : 'let him not threaten me : for his own children it may be well enough that he should scold.' Other instances are *negative*, viz.—

Il. 19. 321 οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακώτερον ἄλλο πάθοιμι.

Od. 14. 122 ὃ γέρον, οὗ τις κείνον ἀνὴρ ἀλαλήμενος ἐλθὼν
ἀγγέλλων πείσειε γυναῖκά τε καὶ φίλον νιόν.

So in the Relative clauses, Il. 5. 303 (= 20. 286) ὃ οὐ δύο γ' ἄνδρε φέροιεν, Od. 3. 319 ὅθεν οὐκ ἐλποῖτό γε θυμῷ ἐλθέμεν. And in one or two *interrogative* clauses, with implied negation: Il. 11. 838 πῶς τ' ἄρ' εἶσι τάδε ἔργα; Od. 5. 100 τίς δ' ἂν ἐκὼν διαδράμοι (since we should probably read τίς δὲ Φεκῶν). In such case the absence of *κεν* or *ἂν* marks the negation as sweeping and unconditional. We should compare the corresponding Homeric use of *οὐ* with the pure Subj., which differs in the degree of confidence expressed: οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι *I am sure I shall never see*, οὐ πάθοιμι *I suppose I shall never suffer*.

300.] With *κεν* or *ἂν* the Optative does not express *wish* (which is essentially unconditional), or even direct *willingness* on the part of the speaker, but only *willingness to admit a consequence*: hence *expectation* in view of *particular circumstances*: *e.g.*—

Il. 1. 100 τότε κέν μιν ἱλασσάμενοι πεπείθοιμεν
then we may expect to appease him and gain grace.

The character of a Clause of this kind depends chiefly on the manner in which the *condition* is indicated. The following are the main points to be observed:—

(a) An Opt. with *κεν* or *ἂν* often follows an independent Clause with a Future, Imperative, &c.:—

Il. 22. 108 ὧς ἐρέουσιν, ἐμοὶ δὲ τότ' ἂν πολὺν κέρδιον εἴη κτλ.

Od. 10. 269 φεύγωμεν' ἔτι γάρ κεν ἀλύξαιμεν κακὸν ἡμάρ.

Il. 3. 410 κεῖσε δ' ἐγὼν οὐκ εἴμι, νεμεσσητὸν δὲ κεν εἴη.

(b) Or the preceding Clause may contain a *wish*:—

Il. 7. 157 εἴθ' ὧς ἡβώοιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἐμπεδος εἴη
τῷ κε τάχ' ἀντήσειε κτλ.

Cp. Il. 4. 93 (where the preceding Opt. is a gentle Imper.).

(c) The case supposed may be in past time, so that the Optative expresses what *would have* followed on an event which did not occur: *e.g.*—

Il. 5. 311 καὶ νύ κεν ἐνθ' ἀπόλοιτο ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε κτλ.

Od. 5. 73 ἐνθα κ' ἔπειτα καὶ ἀθάνατός περ ἐπελθὼν
θηήσαιο ἰδών.

So Il. 2. 81., 3. 220., 4. 223, 429, 539., 5. 85, 311, 388., 12. 58., 13. 127, 343., 15. 697., 17. 70, 366, 398, Od. 7. 293., 13. 86. This use of the Optative is confined to Homer, and is chiefly found in the *Iliad*.

A somewhat similar idiom occurs in Herodotus; *e.g.* Hdt. 1. 2 εἴσαν δ' ἂν οὗτοι Κρήτες 'these may have been Cretans' (=probably were), 7. 180 τάχα δ'

ἄν τι καὶ τοῦ οὐνόματος ἐπαύροιο. But there the meaning is different—not *would have happened* (= *did not*), but *would be found to have happened* (if we knew more).

(d) The case supposed may be vague or imaginary:—

Il. 8. 143 ἀνὴρ δέ κεν οὐ τι Διὸς νόον εἰρύσσαιτο,
where the emphatic ἀνὴρ suggests a condition: *if a man, he cannot &c.*; cp. Od. 4. 78., 23. 125, also—

Od. 12. 102 πλησίον ἀλλήλων· καὶ κεν διοίστεύσεις
one may (on occasion arising) shoot an arrow across.

9. 131 οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακή γε, φέροι δέ κεν ὧρα πάντα.

It is natural that an *admission* that something *may* happen should generally be made more or less in view of circumstances, given or supposed. Hence the use of κεν or ἄν with an Opt. of this force became the prevailing use, and exceptions are rare, even in Homer.

The principal clause or Apodosis of an ordinary Complex Conditional Sentence belongs to this head. It is erroneous, however, to regard the varieties now explained as complex sentences with the Protasis understood. In this, as in some other cases, the complex is to be explained from the simple, not *vice versa*.

In some instances the Opt. with κεν appears to be *concessive* (expressing *willingness*). Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* I. p. 200) gives as examples—

Il. 22. 252 νῦν αὐτὲ με θυμὸς ἀνῆκε
στήμεναι ἀντία σείο· ἔλοιμ' κεν ἢ κεν ἀλοίην.

Od. 8. 570 τὰ δέ κεν θεὸς ἢ τελέσειεν
ἢ κ' ἀτέλεστ' εἴη, ὥς οἱ φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ.

To which may be added Od. 14. 183 ἢ κεν ἀλοίη ἢ κε φύγοι κτλ. (but Il. 13. 486 is different). Possibly the use of κεν in these places is due to the opposition made between the two alternatives: cp. § 285, 3, b, § 286, and § 289, 2, b.

Il. 24. 618 ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ νῶϊ μεδώμεθα, διε γεραιέ,
σίτου· ἔπειτά κεν αὐτε φίλον παῖδα κλαίοισθα.

Hes. Op. 33 τοῦ κε κορεσσάμενος νείκεα καὶ δῆριν δφέλλοις.
Also Od. 16. 391., 21. 161. But these instances need not be separated from others in which expectation rather than concession is recognised. We may notice as on the border between the two meanings—

(a) Uses of the First Person (esp. in the Odyssey): *e.g.*—

Od. 15. 506 ἦῶθεν δέ κεν ὑμῖν ὁδοιπόριον παραβείμην.

22. 262 ὦ φίλοι, ἦδη μὲν κεν ἐγὼν εἴποιμι καὶ ἄμμιν κτλ.

16. 304 ἀλλ' οἶοι σύ τ' ἐγὼ τε γυναικῶν γνῶμεν ἰθύν,
καὶ κέ τεο δμῶων ἀνδρῶν ἔτι πειρηθείμεν.

14. 155 πρὶν δέ κε, καὶ μάλα περ κεχρημένος, οὗ τι δεχοίμην.
So Od. 2. 219., 4. 347., 12. 387., 15. 313, 449., 18. 166., 19. 579.,
20. 326., 21. 113, 193, Il. 9. 417., 24. 664.

(β) Negative Clauses, with the Second Person :—

Il. 14. 126 τῷ οὐκ ἂν με . . φάντες | μῦθον ἀτιμῆσαιτε
I do not think you will (I expect you not to) &c.

Od. 20. 135 οὐκ ἂν μιν νῦν, τέκνον, ἀνάστιον αἰτιόω.

So Il. 2. 250 τῷ οὐκ ἂν βασιλῆας ἀνὰ στόμ' ἔχων ἀγορεύεις is to be understood as ironical courtesy (*you will not if you are advised by me*). This, again, when turned into a question yields another form of polite Imperative; as Il. 3. 52 οὐκ ἂν δὴ μείνεις *will you not await?* So Il. 5. 32, 456., 10. 204, Od. 6. 57., 7. 22.

The fact that οὐ is the negative Particle in all these instances shows that the Optative is grammatically more akin to a Future than to an expression of *wish*. So far as wish is intended, the use is a *rhetorical* one, implying what it does not directly express, like the similar use of the Future Indicative in Attic.

It will be seen that, except in one or two rare Homeric uses of the pure Opt., the usage of the Opt. in independent Sentences is nearly the same in Homer as in later Greek.

Optative in Subordinate Clauses.

301.] The classification which has been followed in discussing the Subordinate Clauses with the Subjunctive will also be the most convenient in the case of the Optative. Indeed there is so close a parallelism between the uses of these two Moods that little is now left to do except to take clauses of the several types already analysed, and show in each case the difference which determines the use of one Mood rather than the other.

The reason for using an Optative will generally be found in the circumstance that the governing Verb is incompatible with a subordinate clause expressing either the *will* or the *assured expectation* of the speaker. If the occasion to which the whole sentence refers is *past*, or is a mere *possibility*, or an *imaginary* case, these two meanings of the Subjunctive are generally out of place—and we can only have the Mood which expresses a wish, or an admission of possibility. Hence it is a general rule—to which however we have found important exceptions (§ 298)—that the Optative must be used when the principal Verb is an Optative, or one of the Secondary Tenses.

302.] Clauses with ἤέ—ἤε. The Optative in the Homeric examples is generally to be explained as the translation of the Subjunctive into *oratio obliqua*; that is to say, it expresses a doubt or deliberation thrown back into the past.

speaker's present point of view, not subordinated to the point of view fixed by the governing Verb. Thus in—

Od. 4. 698 ἀλλὰ πολλὰ μείζον τε καὶ ἀργαλέωτερον ἄλλο
μνηστῆρες φράζονται, ὃ μὴ τελέσειε Κρονίων

we have an independent *parenthetical wish*: and in—

Il. 3. 234 νῦν δ' ἅλλους μὲν πάντας ὀρώ . . οὓς κεν ἐν γνοίην κτλ.

5. 303 (= 20. 286) μέγα ἔργον, ὃ οὐ δύο γ' ἄνδρε φέροιεν
a *parenthetical expectation* (§ 299, f). In other places the Relative Clause is connected, by implication at least, with the action of the principal Clause, and expresses an *intended* or *expected consequence*. We may distinguish the following cases:—

(1) In Final Clauses—

(a) The choice of the Opt. shows *want of confident expectation* of the result intended:—

Il. 1. 62 ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ τινα μάντιν ἐρελομεν ἢ ἱερεῖα, . .
ὅς κ' εἴποι κτλ. (*with the view that he may tell*: cp.
7. 342., 21. 336, Od. 5. 166).

7. 231 ἡμεῖς δ' εἰμὲν τοιοὶ οἱ ἂν σέθεν ἀντιάσαιμεν
καὶ πολέες (= *many of us are ready to meet thee*).

Od. 10. 431 τί κακῶν ἱμείρετε τούτων,
Κίρκης ἐς μέγαρον καταβήμεναι, ἢ κεν ἅπαντας
ἢ σὺς ἢ ἐλκύους ποιήσεται ἢ ἐλόντας,
οἳ κέν οἱ μέγα δῶμα φυλάσσοιμεν καὶ ἀνάγκη.

Here *ποιήσεται* (Subj.) expresses the immediate result, *φυλάσσοιμεν* (in the *further* and therefore (in the nature of things) *less confidently* asserted consequence.

In this group of Clauses the Opt. always takes *κεν* or *ἂν* (cp. the corresponding Subj., § 282).

(b) The Opt. with *κεν* is especially common after a principal Clause of *negative* meaning (in which case the consequence is necessarily matter of mere *supposition*): as—

Il. 5. 192 ἱπποὶ δ' οὐ παρέασι καὶ ἄρματα τῶν κ' ἐπιβαίην.

Od. 1. 253 ἢ δὴ πολλὸν ἀποιοχόμενον Ὀδυσῆος
δεῦρ, ὃ κε μνηστῆρσιν ἀναιδέσι χεῖρας ἐφέη.

5. 16 οὐ γάρ οἱ πάρα νῆες ἐπήρετμοι καὶ ἐταῖροι,
οἳ κέν μιν πέμποιεν.

The pure Opt. occurs in Il. 22. 348 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς . . ἀπαλάλκοι.

(c) The Opt. is used if the governing Verb is an Optative, or a Secondary Tense: *c.g.*—

Il. 14. 107 νῦν δ' εἴη ὅς τῇσδ' γ' ἀμείνονα μῆτιν ἐνίσποι.

Od. 6. 113 ὥς Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔγροϊτο, ἴδοι τ' εὐώπιδά κούρην,
ἢ οἱ Φαίηκων ἀνδρῶν πόλιν ἡγήσαιο.

Od. 5. 240 αὖα πάλαι, περίκηλα, τὰ οἱ πλώοιεν ἐλαφρῶς
dry, such as would float.

(2) After Verbs that express *asking* or *finding out* the Clause acquires the force of a dependent Interrogative, and so of an *Object* Clause:—

Od. 9. 331 αὐτὰρ τοὺς ἄλλους κλήρῳ πεπαλάσθαι ἄνωγον
ὅς τις τολμήσειεν κτλ. (*for the man*) who should &c.

Il. 3. 316 κλήρους πάλλον . . ὁππότερος ἀφείη
they cast lots for which of the two should throw.

14. 507 (= 16. 283) πάπτηνεν δὲ ἕκαστος ὅπρι φύγοι.

So Il. 6. 177., 10. 503, Od. 9. 88., 10. 101, 110., 19. 464. As to the form of the Relative Clause see § 267, 2, c.

The Dependent Interrogative properly so called is rare in Homer:—

Il. 5. 85 Τυδεΐδην δ' οὐκ ἂν γνώης ποτέροισι μετεΐη.

Od. 15. 423 εἰρώτα δὴ ἔπειτα τίς εἴη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι.

17. 368 ἀλλήλους τ' ἐρέοντο τίς εἴη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι.

It is evidently akin to the Optatives with ἦ—ἦ which express past *doubt* (§ 302, b): τίς εἴη who he should be comes to mean who he should prove to be. Cp. the Subj. in the corresponding Clauses relating to present time (§ 280).

305.] Relative Clauses—Conditional. When the event to which the condition attaches is matter of *wish* or mere *expectation*, or is in *past* time, the condition is generally expressed by the Optative. Hence we find the Optative—

(a) With an Optative of *wish* in the principal Clause:—

Il. 3. 299 ὁππότεροι πρότεροι ὑπὲρ ὄρκια πημήνειαυ,
ὦδέ σφ' ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέοι ὥς ὅδε οἶνος.

Od. 1. 47 ὥς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι.

(b) With an Optative of *expectation*:—

Il. 9. 125 οὐ κεν ἀλλῆϊος εἴη ἀνὴρ ᾧ τόσσα γένοιτο
he will not be poor to whom such things come.

12. 228 ὦδέ χ' ὑποκρίναιτο θεοπρόπος δς σάφα θυμῷ
εἰδείη τεράων καὶ οἱ πειθόλατο λαοί
so will a diviner answer, who knows &c.

Od. 4. 222 δς τὸ καταβρόξειεν . .

οὐ κεν ἐφημέριός γε βάλοι κατὰ δάκρυ παρειῶν.

The Opt. of the governing Clause may be itself subordinate:—

Od. 2. 53 ὥς κ' αὐτὸς ἐδυνώσαιο θύγατρα,
δοίη δ' ᾧ κ' ἐθέλοι καὶ οἱ κεχαρισμένος ἔλθοι.

(c) After a Present or Future, in one or two places where the time is purposely vague :—

Od. 6. 286 καὶ δ' ἄλλῃ νεμεσῶ, ἢ τις τοιαυτὰ γε ῥέξοι
= *I am ready to be angry with any other who &c.*

19. 510 καὶ γὰρ δὴ κοίτοιο τάχ' ἔσσεται ἡδέος ὥρη,
ὅν τινά γ' ὕπνος ἔλοι κτλ. (ἔλῃ *La R.*)

The Opt. avoids assuming that the case will ever occur.

The reading is very doubtful in Il. 5. 407 ὅττι μάλ' οὐ δηναῖος δὲ ἀθανάτοισι μάχοιτο, the Ambrosian and some others having μάχεται.

(d) When the principal Verb is in a past Tense; the Relative Clause generally expressing *indefinite frequency*, iteration, &c.: as—

Il. 2. 188 ὅν τινα μὲν βασιλῆα καὶ ἔξοχον ἄνδρα κιχέει,
τὸν δ' ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσσιν ἐρητύσασκε.

15. 22 ὃν δὲ λάβοιμι ῥίπτασκον τεταγὼν κτλ.

Od. 22. 315 παύεσκον μνηστῆρας ὅτις τοιαυτὰ γε ῥέξοι.

In these uses, and generally, the Opt. is pure. Exceptions are—

Od. 4. 600 δῶρον δ' ὅττι κέ μοι δοίης κειμήλιον ἔσω
(where the Opt. may be substituted for the Subj. for the sake of courtesy, to avoid assuming the certainty of the gift),—

Od. 21. 161 ἡ δέ κ' ἔπειτα
γῆμαιθ' ὅς κε πλεῖστα πόροι καὶ μόρσιμος ἔλθοι.

Clauses formed by a Relative and the *pure* Optative are strictly parallel to the Conditional Clauses formed by a Relative and the *pure* Subjunctive, such as χαίρει δέ μιν ὅς τις ἐθείρῃ, or βέλτερον δὲ φεύγων προφύγῃ (§ 283, a). In both groups of Clauses the reference is *indefinite*; but with the Subj. the instances must be thought of as *future* instances, and consequently the governing Verb must not imply that they are *past* or *imaginary*.

It may happen that the condition is expressed by the Subj. (because regarded as certain to be fulfilled), while the main action is uncertain, and therefore put in the Opt.: as—

Il. 14. 126 τῷ οὐκ ἂν με γένος γέ κακὸν καὶ ἀνάλκιδα φάντες
μῦθον ἀτιμήσατε πεφασμένον, ὃν κ' ἐὺ εἴπω.

20. 250 ὅπποιόν κ' εἴπησθα ἔπος, τοῖόν κ' ἐπακούσais.

So with εἰ, as Od. 2. 218 εἰ μέν κεν ἀκούσω, ἢ τ' ἂν τλαίην, cp. 11. 104, 110., 12. 137. But the general rule is to let the subordinate Clause follow the Mood of the governing Verb: hence the so-called 'Attraction' of the Optative.

306.] Clauses with ὥς, ὅπως, ἵνα and the Opt. are either Final or Object Clauses (not Conditional in Homer, see the note at the end of this section).

(1) In Final Clauses the Opt. may be used either (a) to

indicate that the consequence is not immediate or certain (the governing Verb having a present or future meaning), or (*b*) because the governing Verb is an Opt., or (*c*) a Secondary Tense. Thus we have the Opt.—

(*a*) After a Present, &c. in the principal Clause; especially when the Clause bears a *negative* meaning (so that the occasion is necessarily imaginary):—

Il. 1. 343 οὐδέ τι οἶδε νοῆσαι ἅμα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω,
ὅπως οἱ παρὰ νηυσὶ σόοι μαχέονται Ἀχαιοί.

(*μαχέονται* however is not a good Homeric form, and makes an intolerable hiatus: read probably *μαχέονται*, cp. § 326, 3).

Od. 2. 52 οἱ πατὴρς μὲν ἐς οἶκον ἀπερρίγασι νέεσθαι
Ἰκαρίου, ὥς κ' αὐτὸς ἐδυνώσαιο θύγατρα.

But also after an affirmative Clause:—

Od. 23. 134 ἡγέσθω φιλοπαίγμονος ὄρχηθμοῖο,
ὥς κέν τις φάη γάμον ἔμμεναι ἐκτὸς ἀκούων
= so that any one who happens to hear may think &c.

12. 156 ἀλλ' ἐρέω μὲν ἐγὼν ἵνα εἰδότες ἦ κε θάναμην
ἢ κεν ἀλευάμενοι θάνατον καὶ κῆρα φύγοιμεν
(the Opt. of the less emphatic alternative, § 275, *b*).

17. 249 τὸν ποτ' ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νηὸς εὐστέλμοιο μελαίνης
ἄξω τῇλ' Ἰθάκης, ἵνα μοι βίον πολὺν ἄλφοι
(*ποτέ* indicates a *distant* occasion).

13. 401 κινζώσω δέ τοι ὅσσε πάρος περικαλλεῖ ἔοντε,
ὥς ἂν ἀεικέλιος πᾶσι μνηστήρσι φανεῖς (so 16. 297).

24. 532 ἴσχεσθε . . ὥς κεν . . διακρινωθεῖτε (leg. *διακρινωθήτε*?).

(*b*) After an Optative, either of *wish* or of *expectation*: especially in the *Odyssey*, as—

Od. 14. 407 τάχιστα μοι ἔνδον ἐταῖροι
εἶεν, ἵν' ἐν κλισίῃ λαρὸν τετυκοῖμεθα δόρπον.

15. 537 τῷ κε τάχα γνώης . . ὥς ἂν τίς σε . . μακαρίζοι.

So Od. 18. 369., 20. 81: and *a fortiori* after an implied *prohibition*—

Od. 3. 346 Ζεὺς τό γ' ἀλεξήσκει . . ὥς ὑμεῖς . . κίοιτε
Zeus avert that you should go &c.

(*c*) After a Past Tense—a use of which it is needless to give examples.

Regarding the use of *κεν* and *ἂν*, it is to be observed that—

1. The Opt. with *ἵνα* and *ὅπως* is always pure.

2. The Opt. with *ὥς* takes *κεν* or *ἂν* in a few places where there is clear reference to a single occasion, as in Od. 2. 52

(quoted above), Il. 19. 331, Od. 17. 362; and in the combinations ᾽ως ἄν τις (Od. 15. 538), ᾽ως κέν τις (Od. 23. 135).

(2) The corresponding Object Clause with ᾽ως and ᾽οπως is found (a) after Verbs of *trying, considering how, &c.* as—

Il. 2. 3 ἀλλ' ὃ γε μερμήριζε κατὰ φρένα ᾽ως Ἀχιλλῆα
τιμήσει' δλέσαι δὲ κτλ.

The reading *τιμήσει*^{ει} is supported by Ven. A, which has *τιμήσῃ* (*τιμήσει* *εὐκτικόν* Schol. A. B.): all other authorities have *τιμήσῃ*, and all have *δλέσαι*.

Il. 9. 181 *πειρᾶν ᾽ως πεπίθοιεν* (*bade them try how to persuade*).

21. 137 ὥρμηνεν δ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν ὅπως παύσειε (so 24. 680).

Od. 14. 329 ὅπως νοστήσει' Ἰθάκης ἐς πλοῖνα δῆμον.

This reading is proved (against *νοστήσῃ* of the MSS.) by the parallel Od. 19. 298 ὅπως νοστήσειε φίλῃν ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν. Cp. also Od. 9. 420, 11. 479.

In one place ᾽ως with the Opt. follows a Verb of *saying*, viz. in Od. 24. 237 (*μερμήριξε*) εἰπεῖν ᾽ως ἔλθοι καὶ ἴκοιτ' ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν *to tell how he had come*. This is the only Homeric instance of ᾽ως with the Opt. in *oratio obliqua*. The next is H. Ven. 215 εἶπεν δὲ ἕκαστα, ᾽ως ἔοι ἀθάνατος κτλ.

An example of ὅπως and the Opt. with iterative meaning (nearly = ὅτε, § 308, 1, d) occurs in Hesiod, Theog. 156 καὶ τῶν μὲν ὅπως τις πρῶτα γένοιτο πάντας ἀποκρύπτασκε. This use is to be classed as Conditional, like the corresponding uses of ᾽ως and ὅπως with the Subj., § 285, 3.

307.] Clauses with ἕως (ἥος) and ὅφρα. These also are Final in character: *i. e.* the Conjunction has the meaning *till the time that*, hence (commonly) *in order that*,—not *while, so long as*.

The notion of *time* is distinct in—

Od. 12. 437 νωλεμέως ἐχόμην ὅφρ' ἐξεμέσειεν ὀπίσσω
until it should vomit forth again (so 12. 428., 20. 80).

Od. 23. 151 εἴρυσθαι μέγα δῶμα διαμπερὲς ἥος ἴκοιτο
till he should come (so 5. 386., 9. 376).

It is indistinct, or lost, in the ordinary use of ὅφρα, as—

Il. 6. 170 δεῖξαι δ' ἠνώγει φ' πενθερῷ ὅφρ' ἀπόλοιτο.

Od. 12. 427 ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ Νότος ὦκα, φέρων ἐμῷ ἄλγεα θυμῷ,
ὅφρ' ἔτι τὴν ὀλοὴν ἀναμετρήσαιμι Χάρυβδι
to the end that I should measure again &c.

and with ἕως in Od. 4. 799 πέμπε δέ μιν . . ἥος Πηνελόπειαν παύσειε κλαυθμοῖο, and other places in the Odyssey (5. 386., 6. 80., 19. 367).

The corresponding form of Object Clause with these Conjunctions may be traced in one instance of each, viz. Il. 4. 465 λελημένος ὅφρα τάχιστα τεύχεα συλήσειε, and Od. 19. 367 ἀρώμενος ἥος ἴκοιο. Here, after a Verb of *wishing*, the meaning *until* passes into the simple *that*.

With *ἔως* and *ὅφρα* the Opt. is nearly always pure: but we have *ὅφρ' ἄν* in Od. 17. 298 (*until*), 24. 334: and *ἔως κεν* in—

Od. 2. 77 τόφρα γὰρ ἄν κατὰ ἄστν ποτιπυσοίμεθα μύθῳ
χρήματ' ἀπαιτίζοντες, ἔως κ' ἀπὸ πάντα δοθείη,
where there is a stress on the *particular* time contemplated. So—

Il. 15. 69 ἐκ τοῦ δ' ἄν τοι ἔπειτα παλλῶξιν παρὰ νηῶν
αἰὲν ἐγὼ τεύχομαι διαμπερές, εἰς ὃ κ' Ἀχαιοὶ
Ἴλιον αἰπὺ ἔλοιεν (the only instance with *εἰς ὃ*).

The similar uses of *ἔστε*, *ἄχρι*, *μέχρι* are post-Homeric.

The chief instance of *ὅφρα* with an Opt. following a Fut. or Subj. is Il. 7. 339 πύλας ποιήσομεν . . ὅφρα . . ὁδὸς εἴη. But the example is open to doubt, partly because there may be a Subj. εἴη (see § 80), partly because the line also occurs (7. 349) where the governing Verb is an Imperfect, and it may have been wrongly inserted in v. 339. In other places—as Il. 7. 72, Od. 5. 378., 15. 51., 22. 444—where some editions have Opt. forms, the Subj. is to be restored. It is true that the Opt. is found after the Future with other Conjunctions, to express remoteness or uncertainty; but a word which literally means *till the time that* could not naturally be used to express a *remote* end or consequence.

308.] Clauses with ὅτε, ὁπότε, &c. Most Clauses of this kind are essentially—

(1) Conditional. The Verb of the principal Clause may be—

(a) An Optative of *wish*: as—

Il. 21. 428 τοιοῦτοι νῦν πάντες, ὅσοι Τρώεσσιν ἄρωγός,
εἶεν ὄτ' Ἀργείοισι μαχόλατο (cp. Il. 18. 465, &c.).

(b) An Optative of *expectation*: as—

Od. 13. 390 καὶ κε τριηκοσίοισιν ἐγὼν ἄνδρεσσι μαχοίμην
σὺν σοί, πότνα θεά, ὅτε μοι πρόφρασσ' ἐπαρήγοις.

Il. 14. 247 Ζηνὸς δ' οὐκ ἄν ἔγωγε Κρονίονος ἄσسون ἰκοίμην,
οὐδὲ κατευνήσαιμ' ὅτε μὴ αὐτός γε κελεύει.

(c) A Future: in one place, viz. Il. 13. 317 αἰπὺ οἱ ἔσσειται . . νῆας ἐνιπρῆσαι ὅτε μὴ αὐτός γε Κρονίων ἐμβάλοι κτλ., where the speaker does not wish to imply the fulfilment of the condition.

In Od. 24. 343 ἔνθα δ' ἀνὰ σταφυλαὶ παντοῖαι ἔασιν, ὁπότε δὴ Διὸς ὤραι ἐπιβρίσειαν the Present *ἔασιν* is open to suspicion, because all the rest of the description is in the past tense; with which the Opt. is in harmony.

In Il. 4. 263 ἔστηχ' ὥς περ ἐμοί, πῖέειν ὅτε θυμὸς ἀνάνχοι the Opt. is read by most MSS. It may be regarded as an Opt. of the *remoter* event (§ 305, c), depending on *πῖέειν*, which is an Inf. of *purpose* (Goodwin § 555). But La Roche reads *ἀνάγχη*.

(d) A Past Tense, generally of an event which happens repeatedly or habitually, as—

Il. 1. 610 ἔνθα πάρος κοιμᾷθ' ὅτε μιν γλυκὺς ὕπνος ἱκάνοι.

21. 265 ὅσάκι δ’ ὀρμήσειε κτλ. *as often as he started &c.*

Od. 8. 87 ἦ τοι ὅτε λήξειεν . . ἔλεσκεν (iterative).

So with ὅτε after πρίν, in Il. 9. 486 οὐκ ἐθέλεσκες . . πρίν γ’ ὅτε δὴ . . ἄσαιμι = *you would only . . when &c.*: cp. § 297.

In these cases the Opt. after a past tense answers to the pure Subj. after a Present, § 289, 2, *a*. In one place the Opt. with ὅτε represents the Subj. with ὅτε κεν, viz. in Od. 20. 138 ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ κόϊτοιο καὶ ὕπνου μιμνήσκειτο, ἡ μὲν δέμνι’ ἀνωγεν ὑποσπορέσαι δμωῇσι *bade them spread the couch against the time when he should bethink him &c.*

In this group of uses the Opt. is pure, except in—

Il. 9. 524 οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπενθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν
ἠρώων, ὅτε κέν τιν’ ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἴκοι,

where the κέν may be accounted for by the change from the Plural to the Singular: cp. § 283, *b, c*.

(2) After a Past Tense of a Verb of *waiting* ὁπότε with the Aorist Opt. forms a kind of Object Clause; as Il. 7. 415 ποτιδέγμενοι ὁππότε’ ἄρ’ ἔλθοι *waiting for (the time) when he should come*; so Il. 9. 191, 18. 524, and (after μένοντες) 4. 334. Cp. § 289 (1).

309.] **Clauses with ἐπεί.** The few examples of this use show the same varieties as with ὅτε. Thus, (*a*) after another Opt.—

Il. 9. 304 νῦν γάρ χ’ Ἔκτορ’ ἔλοις, ἐπεὶ ἂν μάλα τοι σχεδὸν ἔλθοι.

24. 226 αὐτίκα γάρ με κατακτείνειεν Ἀχιλλεύς
ἀγκὰς ἔλόντ’ ἐμὸν νιόν, ἐπὴν γόου ἐξ ἔρον εἴην.

Od. 4. 222 ὅς τὸ καταβρόζειεν, ἐπὴν κρητῆρι μιγείη, κτλ.

(*b*) After a Present, in the statement of a supposed consequence—

Od. 24. 254 τοιούτῳ δὲ ξοικας, ἐπεὶ λούσαιτο φάγοι τε,
εὐδέμεναι (*such a one as would sleep after that &c.*).

(*c*) After a Past tense, in the iterative sense:—

Il. 24. 14 ἀλλ’ ὃ γ’ ἐπεὶ ζεύξειεν κτλ., Od. 2. 105 (= 19. 150.,
24. 140) ἐπὴν δαΐδας παραθεῖτο (*v. l. ἐπεὶ*).

The use of ἂν is intelligible in the first of these passages (Il. 9. 304), since it refers to an event in the immediate future; perhaps also in Il. 24. 227, after an Opt. of *concession*. But as to the form ἐπὴν see § 362.

310.] **πρίν.** The peculiar way of expressing a condition by a Negative followed by πρίν (§ 297) is transferred to the past, the Subj. becoming an Opt., in one passage—

Il. 21. 580 οὐκ ἔθελεν φεύγειν πρίν πειρήσται’ Ἀχιλλῆος.

The Optative with εἰ, &c.

311.] **Optative with εἰ—Conditional Protasis.** The Clause with εἰ expresses a *supposition*, made in order to lead up to the Clause which expresses the *expected consequence*: as—

Od. 1. 163 εἰ κείνόν γ' Ἰθάκηνδε ἰδοίαιτο νοστήσαντα,
πάντες κ' ἄρησάιατ' ἐλαφρότεροι πόδας εἶναι κτλ.

Il. 7. 129 τοὺς νῦν εἰ πτώσσοντας ὑφ' Ἑκτορι πάντας ἀκούσαι,
πολλὰ κεν ἀθανάτοισι φίλας ἀνὰ χεῖρας ἀείραι.

The Clause with εἰ may follow the other, as—

Il. 22. 20 ἦ σ' ἂν τισαίμην, εἰ μοι δύναιμι γε παρεῖη.

The apodosis is generally given by the Opt. with κεν, as in the examples quoted: but we may have the Subj. with κεν, the Future, or the Present. In such cases there is some change of tone between Protasis and Apodosis: as Il. 11. 386 εἰ μὲν δὴ ἀντίβιον σὺν τεύχεσι πειρηθείης, οὐκ ἂν τοι χραίσμῃσι κτλ., where the Subj. is more peremptory than the Opt.: cp. Od. 17. 539 and (Fut.) Il. 10. 222. So with the εἰ-Clause following the other, as Il. 9. 388 κούρην δ' οὐ γαμέω, οὐδ' εἰ ἐρίζοι *I shall not wed the maiden (and would not) even if she rivalled &c.*; cp. Il. 2. 488, Od. 17. 539. The instances of the Opt. following a Present are nearly all in the Odyssey: 1. 414 οὐτ' οὖν ἀγγελίῃ ἔτι πείθομαι εἰ ποθεν ἔλθοι, also 7. 52., 14. 56. In these cases the Present has the force of a general statement (see Goodwin, §§ 409–501). So when the Verb is understood, as—

Il. 9. 318 ἴση μοῖρα μένοντι καὶ εἰ μάλα τις πολεμίζει.

Od. 8. 138 οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγέ τί φημι κακώτερον ἄλλο θαλάσσης
ἄνδρα γε συγχεῖναι, εἰ καὶ μάλα καρτερὸς εἴη
no matter if he is very strong (= even if he should be).

The combination ὥς εἰ (or ὥς εἴ τε) expresses supposition for the purpose of *comparison*; the principal Clause being in a past Tense, as—

Il. 2. 780 οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἴσαν ὥς εἴ τε πυρὶ χθὼν πᾶσα νέμοιτο
(cp. Il. 11. 467., 22. 410, Od. 9. 314., 10. 416, 420., 17. 366).

Or else negative—

Il. 11. 389 οὐκ ἀλέγω ὥς εἴ με γυνὴ βάλοι ἢ πᾶσις ἄφρων.

The use of εἰ with the Opt. in the iterative sense (*if ever, whenever*), which is common in later Greek, is not Homeric: the only passage which might be quoted as an example is—

Il. 24. 768 ἀλλ' εἴ τίς με καὶ ἄλλος ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐνίπτει . .
ἀλλὰ σὺ τὸν γ' ἐπέεσσι παραιφύμενος κατέρυκες.

312.] Optative with εἰ—Wish. The Conditional Protasis, when used without an Apodosis, becomes a form of expressing *wish*:—

Il. 15. 569 Ἀντίλοχ', οὗ τις σείο νεώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν,
οὔτε ποσὶν θάσσω οὐτ' ἄλκιμος ὥς σὺ μάχεσθαι·
εἴ τινά που Τρώων ἐξάλμενος ἄνδρα βάλοισθα.

So Il. 10. 111., 16. 559., 24. 74. More frequently a wish is introduced by εἰ γάρ or αἶ γάρ, as in—

αἶ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίῃ καὶ Ἀπολλων, κτλ.

Such a wish is sometimes used as a form of asseveration, as—

Il. 18. 464 αἶ γάρ μιν θανάτοιο δυσηχέος ᾧδε δυναμένην
νόσφιν ἀποκρύψαι, ὅτε μιν μόρος αἰνὸς ἰκάνοι,
ὥς οἱ τεύχεα καλὰ παρέσσεται

i. e. fair arms shall be his as surely as I wish I could save him from death: so Il. 8. 538, Od. 9. 523: and ironically—

Od. 21. 402 αἶ γὰρ δὴ τοσσοῦτον δῆσιος ἀντιάσειεν,
ὥς οὗτός ποτε τοῦτο δυνήσεται ἐντανύσασθαι.

Here also we must place the wishes expressed by εἴθε or αἶθε, which have generally the character of hopeless *regret*: as εἴθ' ὥς ἠβώοιμι κτλ. It may be noted that in the *Odyssey* *wish* is not expressed by εἰ except in the combinations εἰ γάρ and εἴθε.

A *wish* is often followed by a Clause expressing an expected consequence of its fulfilment; as—

Il. 2. 371 αἶ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ . .
τῷ κε τάχ' ἡμύσειε πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος.

Od. 7. 331 Ζεῦ πάτερ, αἶθ' ὅσα εἶπε τελευτήσειεν ἅπαντα
'Αλκίνοος· τοῦ μὲν κεν ἐπὶ ζεῖδωρον ἄρουραν
ἄσβεστον κλέος εἴη.

So we should probably punctuate—

Il. 13. 485 εἰ γὰρ ὀμηλικὴ γε γενοίμεθα τῷδ' ἐπὶ θυμῷ·
αἰψά κεν ἡὲ φέροιτο μέγα κράτος ἡὲ φερόιμην.

Or we may take αἰψά κεν κτλ. closely with the preceding line, and then it becomes the Apodosis to a Conditional clause. Other examples of this ambiguity are given in § 318.

313.] Optative with εἴ κεν—Conditional Protasis. This is a comparatively rare form; it can generally be explained in accordance with the other uses of κεν:—

Il. 5. 273 εἰ τούτῳ κε λάβοιμεν ἀροίμεθά κε κλέος ἐσθλόν
if (as I propose) we take them, we should &c.
(But perhaps we should read τούτῳ γε.)

9. 141 εἰ δέ κεν Ἄργος ἰκοίμεθ' Ἀχαιῶκόν κτλ.
if (as a further step) we reach Argos &c.

Il. 23. 591

ἵππου δέ τοι αὐτὸς
δώσω, τὴν ἀρόμην· εἰ καὶ νύ κεν οἴκοθεν ἄλλο
μείζον ἐπαιτήσεας, ἄφαρ κέ τοι αὐτίκα δοῦναι
βουλοίμην *if (after that) you demand more &c.*

Od. 2. 76 εἴ χ' ὑμεῖς γε φάγοιτε, τάχ' ἂν ποτε καὶ τίσις εἴη
if (as I say is better, see v. 74) you devour, then &c.

See also Il. 2. 123., 8. 196, 205., 13. 288., 23. 592, Od. 2. 246., 12. 345., 13. 389., 19. 590. And with the Clause with εἰ following the other—

Il. 6. 49 τῶν κέν τοι χαρίσαιοτο πατὴρ ἀπερεῖσι' ἄποινα,
εἴ κεν ἐμὲ ζῶν πεπύθοιτ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.

So Il. 1. 60., 10. 381; cp. Od. 7. 315., 8. 353, and the use of οὐδ' εἴ κεν *not even in case*, Il. 9. 445., 19. 322., 22. 220.

There is one instance of the Opt. with εἰ—ἂν, viz.

Il. 2. 597 εἴ περ ἂν αὐταὶ Μοῦσαι ἀείδοιεν.

314.] **Opt. with εἰ—Final and Object Clauses.** These are generally found after a past Tense in the Principal Clause; *e.g.*—

Il. 2. 97 κήρυκες βοόωντες ἐρήτουν, εἴ ποτ' αὐτῆς
σχοίαντ', ἀκούσειαν δέ κτλ. (*in view that they should &c.*)

Od. 4. 317 ἦλυθον, εἰ τιναῖ μοι κληιδόνα πατρὸς ἐνίσποις
I have come in case you may tell me some &c.

With Verbs of *seeking, trying, desiring, &c.* the Clause with εἰ has the character of an Object Clause: as—

Il. 4. 88 Πάνδαρον ἀντίθεον διζημένη εἴ πον ἐφεύροι
seeking in the hope of finding (= seeking to find).

So Il. 12. 333, Od. 13. 415., 22. 381.

With Verbs of *telling, knowing, seeing, thinking, &c.* this idiom is almost confined to the Odyssey; *e.g.*—

Od. 1. 115 ὁσσόμενος πατέρ' ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ φρεσίν, εἴ ποθεν ἐλθὼν
μνηστήρων τῶν μὲν σκέδασιν κατὰ δώματα θείη
i.e. with the thought in his heart, whether his father would come and scatter the suitors: cp. 5. 439., 9. 317, 421., 18. 375.

Od. 12. 112 εἰ δ' ἄγε δὴ μοι τοῦτο, θεά, νημερτὲς ἐνίσπες
εἴ πως τὴν ὁλοήν μὲν ὑπεκπροφύγοιμι Χάρυβδι
tell me as to the hope that I may escape &c.

In a few places an Object Clause of this kind follows a present Tense:—

Od. 2. 350
ὅν σὺ φυλάσσεις
κείνον διόμενον τὸν κάμμορον εἴ ποθεν ἔλθοι.

14. 119 Ζεὺς . . οἶδε . . εἴ κέ μιν ἀγγελίαιμι ἰδῶν.

20. 224 ἀλλ' ἔτι τὸν δύστηνον δίομαι εἴ ποθεν . . θείη.

So in the only example of the kind found in the *Iliad* :—

Il. 11. 792 τίς δ' οἶδ' εἰ κέν οἱ σὺν δαίμονι θυμὸν ὀρίναις ;

The pure Optative is used in all the places quoted, except the two in which εἰ κεν follows οἶδε (Il. 11. 792, Od. 14. 119). In these the structure is the same as in the corresponding *independent* Clauses (§ 300). That is to say, the phrase τίς οἶδεν εἰ is treated as a mere 'perhaps' (Lat. *nescio an*).

An Opt. in a Final Clause depending upon a Subj. is perhaps to be found in Od. 5. 471 εἰ δέ κεν . . καταδράω εἰ με μεθείη (so all MSS. : μεθήη Bekk.). Cp. § 293.

History of the Subjunctive and Optative.

315.] Uses in Independent Clauses. The uses of the Subj. and Opt. in independent Clauses have been shown to fall in each case into two main groups. In one set of meanings the Mood expresses *desire on the part of the speaker* ; to this belong the Subj. of *command* and *prohibition*, and the Opt. of *wish*. In the other the Mood is a kind of Future ; the Subj. being an emphatic or confident Future (like our Future with *shall*), the Opt. a softened Future, expressing expectation, or mere admission of possibility (the English *may* or *should*).

These two sets of meanings may be called the 'quasi-Imperative,' and the 'quasi-Future.' We must remember however that they are not always clearly separable, but are connected by transitional or intermediate uses : such as (*e.g.*) the Subj. which expresses *necessity* (§ 277), and the Opt. of *concession* (§ 299, *d*).

316.] Uses in Subordinate Clauses. Passing over for the present the question whether the quasi-Imperative or the quasi-Future use is to be regarded in each case as representing the *original* meaning of the Mood, we proceed to consider the uses in Subordinate Clauses. Here the main distinction is that between 'Final' and 'Conditional,' if these terms are used with some latitude : especially if we rank with the Final Clauses not only those which distinctly express the *end* or purpose of an action, but also all Clauses which are referred to the time of the governing Verb. It is true that this distinction does not always apply ; *e.g.* to the Subj. in—

Δαναῶν ὀλοφυρόμεθ' αἰχμητῶν,
οἳ κεν δὴ κακὸν οἶτον ἀναπλήσαντες ὀλωνται

or to the Opt. in—

ἀλλὰ πολὺ μείζον . .
μνηστῆρες φράζονται, δ μὴ τελέσειε Κρονίων.

For there the Relative Clause is in sense a *parenthesis*, and is construed accordingly as an independent Sentence. Again, in—

ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὁλόκλη κτλ.

φρασσόμεθ' ἢ νεώμεθ' ἐφ' ἡμέτερ' ἦε μένωμεν.

δείδιε γὰρ μὴ λαίμον ἀπομήσειε κτλ.

and generally in *Object* Clauses, the Subordinate Clause does not express *end*; but the time from which it is regarded as spoken is fixed by the governing Verb, in the same way that the time of a true Final Clause is fixed by the action of which it gives the end. For the present purpose, accordingly, there are two kinds of Clause to be considered, (1) Final and Object Clauses, and (2) Conditional Clauses.

Regarding the meaning of the Subjunctive and Optative in Final Clauses there can be little doubt. The Subj. in most instances follows either a First Person (Present or Future), or an Imperative: that is to say, it expresses the immediate purpose with which the speaker announces his own action, or commands the action of others. Hence, by a natural transference, it comes to express the purpose of another person (*viz.* the Subject of the Principal Clause). Similarly the Opt., whether as the Mood of *wish* or of *expectation*, comes to express a wish or expectation not now felt, but spoken of. Again, by virtue of its character as a softened or less confident Future, it naturally expresses a *purpose* that does not lie within the speaker's own sphere of action or direct influence.

It should be noticed, too, that the relation which we imply by the term 'Final Clause' may exist without grammatical Subordination, *i. e.* without a Particle such as *ἵνα* or *ὥς* to introduce the clause. Thus in Il. 6. 340 ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐπιμεινον ἀρήϊα τεύχεα δῶω the meaning would not be altered by saying ἐπιμεινον ἵνα δῶω. So in Il. 18. 121-125 νῦν δὲ κλέος ἀροίμην καὶ . . στοναχῆσαι ἐφείην, γνοίεν δ' ὥς δὴ δηρὸν ἐγὼ πολέμοιο πέπαυμαι: the last wish is evidently also the *result* hoped for from the fulfilment of the preceding wishes (so that γνοίεν δέ = ὥς γνοίεν).

In Conditional Clauses, on the other hand, the condition or supposition is not subordinated to the time of the governing Verb, but is made from the *present* point of view of the speaker. The question arises: What is the original force of the Subj. and Opt. in this use?

In the case of the Subj. we naturally look to the quasi-Imperative use. It is common to use the Imperative as a way of stating a supposition; as when we say 'let it be so,' meaning 'if it is so' (cp. Latin *cras petito, dabitur*). This view is confirmed by the fact that negative Conditional Clauses take *μή*, not *οὐ*: that is to say, they are felt to be akin to *prohibition* rather than *denial*. Thus *ὅς μὴ ἔλθῃ* literally means not 'who *will* not come'

(ὅς οὐκ ἂν ἔλθῃ), but 'who *shall* not come,' *i. e.* whom we are not to suppose coming.

Similarly we may understand the Opt. in these Clauses as the Mood of *concession*; 'admitting this to be so': and so in a negative sentence, ὅς μὴ ἔλθοι 'whom I agree to suppose not coming.' For the choice of the Mood does not depend on the greater or less *probability* of the supposition being true, but on the *tone* in which it is made—on the degree of *vividness*, as Mr. Goodwin says, with which it is expressed (*Moods and Tenses*, § 455).

It may be objected that on this view we ought to have εἰ οὐ, not εἰ μὴ, whenever the Verb is in the Indicative. But there is no difficulty in supposing that μὴ was extended to the Indicative on the analogy of the Clauses with the Subj. and Opt.; just as μὴ ὄφελον is an extension from the common use of μὴ in wishes. And this is strongly supported by the circumstance that in fact εἰ οὐ with the Indicative occurs several times in Homer:—

Il. 15. 162 εἰ δέ μοι οὐκ ἐπέεσσ' ἐπιπίσεται κτλ. (so 178).

20. 129 εἰ δ' Ἀχιλεὺς οὐ ταῦτα θεῶν ἐκ πύσεται ὁμῆης.

24. 296 εἰ δέ τοι οὐ δώσει ἐὼν ἄγγελον κτλ.

Od. 2. 274 εἰ δ' οὐ κείνου γ' ἐσσι γόνος κτλ.

See also Il. 4. 160, Od. 12. 382., 13. 143. On the other hand, in the very few examples of εἰ οὐ with a Subj., the οὐ goes closely with the Verb, viz. Il. 3. 289 (οὐκ ἐθέλωσιν), 20. 139 (οὐκ εἰῶσι). On the whole, therefore, it is probable that the Subj. in Conditional Clauses represents the tone of *requirement* in which the speaker *asks us to suppose* the condition to be true: and that the Opt. implies *concession*, or willingness to make the supposition involved.

317.] **Original meaning.** Whether the use of the Subj. as an emphatic Future was derived from its use to express Will, or *vice versa*, and whether the Optative originally expressed *wish* or *supposition*, are questions which take us back to a very early period in the history of Indo-European speech. The two Moods are found in the same uses (generally speaking) in Homer and in the Veda: the formation of these uses therefore belongs in the main to the period before the separation of the different languages,—to the period, indeed, when the original parent language was itself in course of formation. The problem therefore is one on which comparison of the earliest forms of the known Indo-European languages can hardly throw any light. It is as though we were asked to divine whether the use of *shall* in commands (*thou shalt not kill*) or in predictions (*ye shall see me*) is the older, without recourse to earlier English, or to other Germanic languages. Some considerations of a general character may however be suggested:—

(a) The Subj. is strongly differentiated from the Imperative by its Person-Endings, and especially by the existence of a First Person.

(b) In most languages it will be found that the Imperative meaning is expressed in more than one way. Thus in Sanscrit we find the Imperative

proper, the Injunctive, the Subj., and the Optative : in Greek the Imper., the Subj. and certain uses of the Future. The reason of this is evident. Variety in the expression of will and wish is one of the first needs of human society. The form which has been appropriated to express *command* is unsuitable to courteous *request*, still more unsuitable to humble *entreaty*. Accordingly other forms are used, precisely because they are not Imperatives. In time these acquire a quasi-Imperative character, and fresh forms are resorted to as the same want of a non-Imperative mode of expression is again perceived.

(c) The use of the Secondary Endings in the Optative points to the conclusion that in its origin it was a Mood of past time. The tendency to use a past Tense in wishes, and in some kinds of suppositions, may be amply illustrated from English and other modern languages.

(d) The uses with *οὐ* go far to show that the quasi-Future sense of the Subj. and Opt. is at least as primitive as the quasi-Imperative sense. If the strong negation *οὐ γένηται* is derived by gradual change of meaning from a *prohibition*, the appearance of *οὐ* is difficult to explain.

(e) The use of the Subj. as an Imper. may be compared to the Attic use of the Future in a 'jussive' sense, and in Final Clauses to express purpose (Goodwin, p. 373). The change from an expression of will to one of expectation is one to which it would be much more difficult to find a parallel.

318.] **Conditional Protasis with *εἰ*.** The derivations that have been proposed for the Particle *εἰ* or *αἰ* are too uncertain to furnish ground for any theory as to the manner in which the Conditional Protasis may have been formed. The question arises for us on the passages in which *εἰ* with the Opt. is used to express a wish. Thus in *εἰ τις καλέσσει* *I pray some one to call* we may take the Clause as Conditional, with a suppressed Apodosis (*καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι* or the like). Or we may follow L. Lange in holding that the Clause is not Subordinate at all, the Particle *εἰ* being originally a kind of affirmative Interjection, used to introduce expressions of wish and supposition; and we can thus explain the ordinary Complex Conditional Sentence as made up of two originally independent Clauses, viz. (1) a *wish* or *supposition*, introduced by *εἰ*, and (2) an assertion of the consequence to be expected from its being realised. On this theory the Clause of Wish introduced by *εἰ* is not an incomplete Sentence, derived from a Complex Sentence by omission of the Apodosis, but is one of the elements from which the Complex Sentence was itself developed.

The latter of these views has *a priori* the advantage of deriving the complex from the simple: and it has some apparent support in Homeric usage. We find in Homer—

- (1) Wish, standing alone :—

ὥς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε βέξοι.

- (2) Wish followed by an independent Clause expressing expectation of a consequence :—

Od. 15. 180 *οὕτω νῦν Ζεὺς θέλῃ, ἐρίγδουπος πόσις Ἕρως·
τῷ κέν τοι καὶ κείθι θεῷ ὥς εὐχετοφώμην.*

Il. 13. 55 *σφῶν δ' ὧδε θεῶν τις ἐνὶ φρεσὶ ποιήσκειν,
αὐτῷ θ' ἐστάμεναι κρατερῶς καὶ ἀνωγμένον ἄλλους·
τῷ κε καὶ ἐσσόμενον περ ἑωρήσαιν' ἀπὸ νηῶν.*

- (3) Wish, with *εἰ*, *εἰ γάρ*, *εἴθε*, &c., but without 'Apodosis':—
 Il. 4. 189 αἶ γὰρ δὴ οὕτως εἶη, φίλος δ' Μενέλαε.
 II. 670 εἴθ' ὥς ἡβώοιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἶη, κτλ.
- (4) Wish, with *εἰ*, *εἰ γάρ*, *εἴθε*, &c., followed by a Clause of Consequence:—
 Il. 7. 157 εἴθ' ὥς ἡβώοιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἶη·
 τῷ κέ τάχ' ἀντήσσειε κτλ.
 Od. 15. 536 αἶ γὰρ τοῦτο, ξεῖνε, ἔπος τελέσειε Κρονίων·
 γνοίης χ' οἷη ἐμὴ δύναμις καὶ χεῖρες ἔπονται.
- (5) Supposition, with *εἰ*, followed by a Clause of expectation:—
 Il. 7. 129 τοὺς νῦν εἰ πτώσσοντας ὑφ' Ἑκτορι πάντας ἀκούσαι,
 πολλὰ κεν ἀθανάτοισι φίλας ἀνὰ χεῖρας αἶραι.

The similarity in these examples is manifest. The type in the first four sets consists of a Clause of Wish, either alone (1 and 3) or followed by a Clause of Consequence (2 and 4). Again, (5) only differs from (4) in punctuation, so to speak: the two Clauses are taken together, and thus the *εἰ*-Clause is no longer an independent *supposition*, but is one made with a view to the *consequence* expressed in the Clause with *κεν*. And this, it is contended, was the result of a gradual process, such as we find whenever parataxis passes into hypotaxis.

319.] Final Clauses with *εἰ*. An argument for Lange's view of the original force of *εἰ* is found in the use in Final Clauses, such as *εἰμι εἰ κε πίθηται*. The meaning here is essentially different from that of the Conditional sentence *I go if he listens*; and on the ordinary hypothesis, that *εἰ* originally expressed a condition, it is difficult to account for the two uses. But if *εἰ* is a mere interjection, introducing wish or supposition, it is intelligible that the Clause should be Conditional or Final, as the context may determine.

320.] The formula *εἰ δ' ἄγε*, with the varieties *εἰ δ' ἄγε'* (Il. 22. 381) and *εἰ δέ* (Il. 9. 46, 262), is often used in Homer to introduce an Imperative or Subjunctive (§ 275). It has generally been supposed to be elliptical, standing for *εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις ἄγε*, or the like. And *εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις* is actually found with an Imperative in a few places: Il. 19. 142 *εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις ἐπιμεινον*, Od. 16. 82., 17. 277 (cp. 3. 324). It has been pointed out, however, by Lange, in his dissertation on this question,* that *εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις* is only found where it introduces a distinct *second alternative*. Thus in Od. 16. 82 the context is: 'I will send the stranger wherever he desires; or if you choose (*εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις*) take him into your house.' So Od. 3. 323 ἀλλ' ἴθι νῦν σὺν νηϊ . . . *εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις πέζος κτλ.* But with *εἰ δ' ἄγε* this is not the case. We find it at the beginning of a speech; as—

Il. 6. 376 *εἰ δ' ἄγε μοι, δμῶαί, νημέρτεα μυθήσασθε.*

Od. 2. 178 ὦ γέρον, *εἰ δ' ἄγε νῦν μαντεύεο κτλ.*: so Il. 16. 697., 17. 685,

Od. 12. 112., 22. 391., 23. 35.

Or in the Apodosis of a Conditional sentence, as—

Od. 4. 831 *εἰ μὲν δὴ θεός ἐσσι, θεοῖδ' τε ἔκλυες αὐδῆς,*

εἰ δ' ἄγε μοι κτλ.: so Il. 22. 379–381.

Or to express an appeal which is *consequent* upon something just said: as—

Il. 1. 301 τῶν οὐκ ἂν τι φέροις ἀνελὼν ἀέκοντος ἐμείο·

εἰ δ' ἄγε μὴν πείρησαι (*ay, come now and try*): cp. Il. 8. 18.

* *De formula HomERICA εἰ δ' ἄγε commentatio*, Lipsiae 1873.

- II. 1. 523 ἔμοι δέ κε ταῦτα μελήσεται ὄφρα τελέσω·
 εἰ δ' ἄγε τοι κεφαλῇ κατανέυσομαι (so come, I will nod my head).
 23. 579 εἰ δ' ἄγ' ἐγὼν αὐτὸς δικάσω, καὶ μ' οὐ τινά φημι
 ἄλλον ἐπιπλήξειν Δαναῶν· ἰθεὶα γὰρ ἔσται·
 Ἀντίλοχ', εἰ δ' ἄγε δεῦρο . . ὀμνυθὶ κτλ.
 come I will be judge myself . . so come, Antilochus, take this oath :
 see also Od. 1. 271., 9. 37., 21. 217., 24. 336.

Hence, Lange argues, it is probable that εἰ does not express condition, but has an interjectional character (cp. Latin *eia age*) : and if so it may be the same with the use in Clauses expressing wish.

321.] Conclusion. Notwithstanding these arguments, the common explanation of the εἰ-Clause of wish (as primarily a Clause of supposition) seems to be the more probable one.* For—

(1) The uses of εἰ present a marked correspondence with those of the Relative and its derivatives. Note especially the use of ὅτε μή as almost exactly = εἰ μή.

(2) The analogy εἴτα : εἰ :: ἔπειτα : ἐπεὶ makes it likely that εἰ was originally temporal. The fact that εἴτα is not Homeric takes something from the force of this argument.

(3) The use of alternative forms of wish, and the use of some form of supposition to express wish, are phenomena which can be exemplified from many languages : cp. the Latin *o si*, German *wenn, wenn nur*, &c. And ellipse of the apodosis occurs with εἰ-clauses of other kinds ; see § 324.*

(4) The εἰ-clause, whether of supposition or of wish, is specifically Greek, whereas the chief meanings of the Optative—wish, concession, supposition—are much older, being common to Greek and Sanscrit. Hence the εἰ-clause was formed at a time when the Opt. of wish had long been established in use. The presumption surely is that the εἰ-clause, when it came to be used as a form of wish, was a *new* way of expressing wish. It would probably be adopted at first as a less direct form, suited for wishes couched in a different tone (as εἰθε is confined to hopeless wish).

(5) The only use of εἰ not obviously expressive of supposition is that which is seen in the isolated phrase εἰ δ' ἄγε, of which Lange has given an exceedingly probable analysis. Possibly however the εἰ of εἰ δ' ἄγε is not the same word as εἰ *if*, but an interjection, like *ei* and Latin *eia*. We may go further, and point out that the δέ of εἰ δ' ἄγε has been shown by Lange himself to be out of place, hence the true form may be εἴ' ἄγε, like Latin *eia age*.

It may be observed, in conclusion, that the question of the εἰ-clause is quite distinct from the question of the original meaning of the Optative. It is possible to combine Lange's theory of εἰ with Delbrück's earlier view of the Optative as originally the Mood of wish,† but Lange himself does not do so. He regards the εἰ-clause of supposition (*Fallsetzung*) as developed independently of the εἰ-clause of wish. His main thesis is that εἰ does not

* This is also the conclusion maintained by Mr. Goodwin, who discusses the question very fully in the new edition of his *Moods and Tenses* (pp. 376 ff.).

† This view was proposed in Delbrück's *Syntaktische Forschungen* (vol. i. p. 13), but is withdrawn in his recent work (*Altindische Syntax*, § 172).

imply a correlative particle, or an apodosis (*καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι* or the like), so that the two meanings of *εἰ γένοιτο*—*suppose it happened* and *would that it happened*—belong to originally distinct meanings of the Opt. *γένοιτο*. That is to say, the development of *εἰ* with various Moods—Opt., Subj., Indic.—was parallel to an entirely distinct development of interjectional *εἰ* with the Opt. of wish.

322.] **Homeric and Attic uses.** The main difference between Homer and later writers in regard to the Moods may be said to be that the later uses are much more restricted. Thus the Subj. is used by Homer in Principal Clauses of every kind—Affirmative and Negative, as well as Prohibitive, Interrogative, &c. In Attic it is confined to the Prohibitive use with *μή*, and the idiomatic ‘Hortatory’ and ‘Deliberative’ uses.

Again, in Subordinate Clauses the important Homeric distinction between the ‘pure’ Subj. and the Subj. with *ἄν* or *κεν* is almost wholly lost in Attic. In Clauses of Conditional meaning, whether Relational, Temporal, or introduced by *εἰ*, the Subj. with *ἄν* has become the only generally allowable construction: the pure Subj. being confined to a few instances in poetry. With the Optative, on the other hand, an equal uniformity has been attained by the loss of the use with *ἄν* or *κεν*. In short, of the four distinct Homeric constructions—

1. *ὅς ἐλθῃ* (*ὅτε ἐλθῃ, εἰ ἐλθῃ, &c.*)
2. *ὅς ἄν* (or *ὅς κεν*) *ἐλθῃ* (*ὅτ’ ἄν ἐλθῃ, ἐὰν ἐλθῃ, &c.*)
3. *ὅς ἐλθοι* (*ὅτε ἐλθοι, εἰ ἐλθοι, &c.*)
4. *ὅς ἄν* (or *ὅς κεν*) *ἐλθοι* (*ὅτ’ ἄν ἐλθοι, ἐὰν ἐλθοι, &c.*)

the language dropped the first and last: with the result that as *ἄν* always accompanied the Subj. and was absent from the Opt., it ceased to convey a distinct meaning, independent of the meaning given by the Mood. In other words, the use became a mere idiom. The change, though apparently slight, is very significant as an evidence of linguistic progress.

In regard to Final Clauses the most noticeable point is the use of the Relative with a Subjunctive. In this respect Homeric Greek agrees with Latin: while in later Greek the Subj. was replaced, generally speaking, by the Future Indicative. It is also worth observing here that in Homer, as has been said (§ 316), the Final Clause in the great majority of instances expresses the speaker’s own purpose, not a purpose which he attributes to a person spoken of: see §§ 280, 281, 285, 286. In other words, the subordination of the Clause to the governing Verb does not often go so far as to put the Third Person for the First (e. g. *φράσσειται ὥς κε νήνται* = *he will consider—‘how am I to return?’*). The further license by which a past purpose is thought of as if still present—so that the Subj. is used instead of the Opt.—is not Homeric (§ 298).

Modal Uses of the Indicative.

323.] **The Indicative** is primarily the Mood of *assertion*: from which it is an easy step to the use in Negative and Interrogative sentences. It is also used in Greek (as in other languages) to express mere *supposition*: thus we have *εἰ* in a Conditional Protasis with all Tenses (*εἰ ἦν, εἰ ἔστι, εἰ ἔσται*),

where there need be no implication either for or against the truth of the supposition thus made. Further, the Indicative may be used in certain cases in a Conditional Apodosis, expressing an imaginary *consequence*. Again, it may be used in Final and Object Clauses referring to the past or to the future. All such uses, in which the Indicative does not *assert*, may be called *Modal Uses*.

The tendency of language appears to be to extend the Modal Uses of the Indicative, and consequently to diminish the range of the other Moods. It is found possible, and more convenient, to show the modal character of a Clause by means of Particles, or from the drift of the context, without a distinct Verbal form. It will be seen, on comparing the Homeric and Attic usage, that the Indicative has encroached in several points upon the other Moods.

324.] Conditional Clauses (Apodosis). The Secondary Tenses or Tenses of *past time* (Aor. Impf. and Plupf.), are used with *κεν* or *ἄν* to express a supposed consequence: as—

II. 4. 420 δειῶν δ' ἔβραχε χαλκὸς ἐπὶ στήθεσσιν ἀνακτος
ὀρνυμένον· ὑπὸ κεν ταλασίφρονά περ δέος εἶλεν
fear would have seized even the stout-hearted.

This way of speaking of a conditional event ordinarily implies that the condition on which it depended was not fulfilled. For if (*e.g.*) the assertion ἦλθεν *he came* is true, we can hardly ever have occasion to limit it by saying ἦλθεν ἄν *he came in that case*. Hence a Past Tense with *κεν* or *ἄν* naturally came to be used where the event in question had not happened, owing to the non-fulfilment of the condition.

The rule does not apply to events that occur *repeatedly*, or on no particular occasion; for there is no contradiction in saying of such an event that it happened when a condition was fulfilled. Hence the use in the *iterative* sense (as Hdt. 3. 119 κλαίσκε ἄν καὶ ὀδυρέσκετο, Thuc. 7. 71 εἰ τινες ἴδοιεν . . ἀνεθάρσυσάν τε ἄν κτλ.). This use, however, is not Homeric. In Od. 2. 104 ἐνθα κεν ἡματιή μὲν ὑφαίνεσκεν has slender authority, most MSS. reading ἐνθα καί. Another supposed instance is—

Od. 18. 263 ἵππων τ' ὠκυπόδων ἐπιβήτορας, οἳ κε τάχιστα
ἔκριναν μέγα νείκος κτλ.,

where the commentators (Fäsi, Ameis, Merry) take ἔκριναν as a 'gnomic' Aorist. The words as they stand can only mean 'who would most speedily have decided mighty strife' (so Goodwin, § 244): but this does not suit the context. The difficulty is best met by reading οἳ τε: cp. § 283, b.

An exceptional use of a different kind is—

Od. 4. 546 ἡ γάρ μιν ζῶν γε κινήσεται, ἥ κεν Ὀρέστης
κτεῖνεν ὑποφθάμενος.

Here *κεν* marks the alternative (§ 283, n. 2): *either you will find him alive or (in the other case) Orestes has killed him (i.e. must have killed him)*. Thrown into

a Conditional form the sentence would be: 'if you do not find him alive, then Orestes has killed him.' So with an Infinitive—

Il. 22. 108 ἐμοὶ δὲ τότ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη
ἀντην ἢ Ἀχιλλῆα κατακτείναντα νέεσθαι
ἢ ἐκὼν αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι ἔνκλειώς πρὸ πόλεως.

In the Protasis *κεν* with the Indicative occurs only once, viz. Il. 23. 526 εἰ δὲ κ' ἔτι προτέρω γένητο δρόμος (see Leaf's note *a. l.*). This may be compared with the occasional use of *κεν* with *εἰ* and an Opt. (§ 313). The rarity of the use with an Indic. need not be felt as a difficulty: cp. the oracle in Hdt. i. 174 Ζεὺς γάρ κ' ἔθηκε νῆσον εἴ κ' ἐβούλετο, also Erinna, fr. 4, 4, and Ar. Lys. 1098 (Hartung, ii. p. 240).

In later Greek the Imperfect with *ἂν* may express either a continuous action which *would have occurred* at some past time, or an action (continuous or momentary) which *would have been occurring* at the moment of speaking. The latter of these uses, as Mr. Goodwin points out (§ 435), is not Homeric. He sees an approach to it in Il. 24. 220 εἰ μὲν γάρ τίς μ' ἄλλος ἐκέλευεν *were it any one else who bade me*. Another may be found in Od. 20. 307 καὶ κέ τοι ἀντὶ γάμοιο πατὴρ τάφον ἀμφοπινέιτο ἐνθάδε (*if you had struck the stranger*) *your father would have had to busy himself here with your burial in place of wedding*: cp. also Od. 4. 178 καὶ κε θάμ' ἐνθάδ' εἶοντες ἐμισγόμεθ', οὐδέ κεν ἡμέας ἄλλοι δέκρινεν.

The Impf. without *ἂν* or *κεν* may express what *ought to have been*, if the meaning of *fitness*, *obligation*, &c. is given by the Verb or Predicate. Thus we have Od. 20. 331 κέρδιον ἦεν *it would have been better*. So in Attic with *ἐχρῆν*, *ἔδει*, and similar words.

The Opt. with *ἂν* or *κεν*, as we have seen (§ 300, *c*), is not unfrequently used in Homer with the same meaning as the Aor. or Impf. with *ἂν* has in later Greek. This is one of the points in which the use of the Indicative gained on that of the Optative.

324.*] Ellipse of the Apodosis. We may notice here the cases in which *εἰ* with an Indic. or Subj. is not followed by a corresponding Clause expressing the *consequence* of the supposition made. This occurs—

(*a*) When two *alternative* suppositions are made, the second being the one upon which the speaker wishes to dwell: as Il. i. 135 εἰ μὲν δώσουσι γέρας . . εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώσωιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι *if they give* (there is nothing to be said), *but if not*, &c.

(*b*) When the consequence is sufficiently *implied* in the *εἰ*-Clause: as Il. 6. 150 εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαήμεναι *if you wish to be told this* (I will do so): Il. 7. 375 αἶ κ' ἐθέλωσι παύσασθαι

if *they wish to cease* (let them): Od. 21. 260 ἀτὰρ πελέκεάς γε καὶ εἴ κ' εἰώμεν ἅπαντας ἐστάμεν: Il. 19. 147., 20. 213., 21. 487, Od. 4. 388., 15. 80.

(c) When the speaker prefers to *suggest* the consequence in an indirect way: as Il. 1. 580 εἴ περ γάρ κ' ἐθέλῃσιν Ὀλύμπιος ἄστερο-πληγὴς ἐξ ἐδέων στυφελίσσαι, ὃ γὰρ πολὺν φέρτατός ἐστιν *if he wishes* (he will), *for he is strong enough*; Il. 14. 331., 21. 567, Od. 3. 324.

There is a similar omission of the apodosis in Causal Clauses with ἐπεὶ at the beginning of a speech, as Il. 3. 59 Ἔκτορ, ἐπεὶ με κατ' αἴσαν ἐνέεικας: Il. 6. 382 Ἔκτορ, ἐπεὶ μάλ' ἄνωγας κτλ.; Il. 13. 68, 775, Od. 1. 231., 3. 103, 211. The full form appears in Il. 6. 333 ἐπεὶ με κατ' αἴσαν ἐνέεικας . . τοῦνεκά τοι ἐρέω.

In such sentences as εἴ δ' ἐθέλεις . . δαήμεναι some commentators obtain an apodosis by taking the Inf. as equivalent to an Imperative: 'if you wish, then learn &c.' But this is exceedingly forced, and indeed impossible in some places, *e.g.* Il. 7. 375, Od. 21. 260. Elsewhere the apodosis is *forgotten* (anacoluthon); so after εἴ in Il. 22. 111, after ἐπεὶ in Il. 18. 101, Od. 4. 204., 6. 187, 262., 8. 236., 17. 185.

325.] Past Tense by 'Assimilation.' When a Past Tense relating to an event which has not happened is followed by a Subordinate Clause, the Verb of the Subordinate Clause may also be in a Past Tense (the event which it expresses being equally imaginary): as—

Il. 6. 345 ὥς μ' ὄφελ' ἤματι τῷ ὅτε . .
οἴχεσθαι προφέρουσα κακῇ ἀνέμοιο θύελλα,
ἐνθα με κῦμ' ἀπόρσσε κτλ.

and so v. 350 ἀνδρὸς ἔπειτ' ὤφελλον . . ὅς ἤδη κτλ., and Od. 1. 218: also the use with πρὶν, Od. 4. 178 οὐδέ κεν ἡμέας ἄλλο διέκρινεν . . πρὶν γ' ὅτε δὴ θανάτοιο μέλαν νέφος ἀμφεκάλυνεν *nothing would have parted us before the dark cloud of death had wrapped us round.*

This idiom is the same in principle as the use of Past Tenses in Final Clauses, which is common in Attic with ἵνα and ὥς: as Soph. O. T. 1393 τί μ' οὐ λαβὼν ἔκτεινας εὐθύς, ὥς ἔδειξα μὴ ποτε κτλ. *that so I might never have shown &c.* When the context has once shown that we are dealing with a purely imaginary event, the Indicative serves to carry on the train of suppositions. The Indic. is similarly used in an Object Clause after a Verb of *fearing*, as δειδῶ μὴ δὴ πάντα θεὰ νημερτέα εἶπεν.

326.] Future Indicative. The following points have to be noticed:—

1. Homer not unfrequently uses κεν with the Future, the effect being (as with the Subj.) to indicate a limitation or condition: as—

Il. 1. 139 ὁ δέ κεν κεχολώσεται *and he (if I do so) will be angry.*

II. 1. 522 ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν αὖτις ἀπόστιχε μή τι νοήσῃ
 "Ἥρῃ· ἐμοὶ δὲ κε ταῦτα μελήσεται (*to me, as my part*).

4. 76 καὶ κέ τις ὧδ' ἐρέει *in such case men will say*.

This use of *κεν* is chiefly found after *δέ*, as II. 1. 139., 6. 260., 8. 419., 14. 267, &c.: and in Relative Clauses, as II. 12. 226., 17. 241., 22. 70, Od. 5. 36., 8. 318., 16. 438: perhaps with *ὅτε*, II. 20. 335 *ὅτε κεν συμβλήσεται* unless we read *συμβλήσει* as 2 Aor. Subj. (Dindorf, *Thes. Ling. Gr. s. v. βάλλω*). Cp. the use of *κεν* with the Subj., § 275, *b*.

The Future with *ἄν* is very rare: see II. 9. 167., 22. 66.

2. The use of the Future with the force of a *gentle Imperative* has been ascribed to Homer, but without sufficient ground. Where it appears to take the place of an Imperative it will be found in reality to express the *indifference* of the speaker; as—

II. 6. 70 ἀλλ' ἄνδρας κτείνωμεν· ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐκηλοῖ
 νεκροὺς ἅμ' πεδίον συλήσετε τεθνηῶτας
then you can (if you like) strip the dead of their arms.

20. 137 ἡμεῖς μὲν καθεζόμεσθα . . πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεσσι
 μελήσει (*we will leave war to men*).

The forms *οἴσεται* and *ᾔξετε*, which are sometimes given as instances of this use, do not belong to the Future, but are Imperatives of an Aorist (§ 41).

3. The Future is occasionally found in Final Clauses with nearly the force of the Subj.: viz. with the Conjunctions *ὅπως* in Od. 1. 57 *θέλγει ὅπως Ἰθάκης ἐπιλήσεται charms so that he may forget Ithaca*, also in II. 1. 344 (if with Thiersch we read *ὅπως μαχέονται Ἀχαιοὶ* for the anomalous *μαχέονται*), and with *ὅφρα*, as—

II. 8. 110 Τρωσὶν ἐφ' ἵπποδάμοις ἰθύνομεν, ὅφρα καὶ Ἔκτωρ
 εἴσεται κτλ. (so II. 16. 242, Od. 4. 163., 17. 6).

So with *μή*, II. 20. 301 *μή πως καὶ Κρονίδης κεχολώσεται*, Od. 24. 544.

The Future with *κεν* in Relative Clauses sometimes appears to express *end*, as in II. 1. 174 *πάρ' ἔμοιγε καὶ ἄλλοι οἳ κέ με τιμήσουσι*: cp. 2. 229., 23. 675, Od. 8. 318., 16. 438. So without *κεν* in II. 24. 154, Od. 14. 333. In all these places, however, as in the corresponding uses of the Subj. (§ 282), and Opt. (§ 304), it is difficult to say how far the notion of *end* is distinctly expressed: in other words, how far the future action is subordinated to that of the main Verb.

4. The use of the Future in *Object Clauses* (common in Attic after Verbs of *striving*, &c.) may perhaps be seen in II. 12. 59 *μενοῖνεον εἰ τελέουσι*, also Od. 5. 24., 13. 376.

It is sometimes impossible to decide whether a form is a Future or an Aorist Subj.: e.g. in Od. 1. 269 *σὲ δὲ φράσσειν ἄνωγα ὅπως κε μνηστῆρας*

ἀπώσσει, where the Verb may be a Future, as in the places now quoted, or a Subj., according to the commoner Homeric construction. So in Il. 10. 44, 282., 17. 144.

The use of the Future in Final Clauses is probably later than that of the Subjunctive. In general, as we have seen, the Subj. is akin to the Imperative, and therefore expresses the speaker's *purpose* directly, by its own force; whereas the Fut. Ind. properly expresses *sequence*. Thus θέλγει ὥς λάθηται literally means 'charms so that he *shall* forget': θέλγει ὅπως λήσεται 'charms so that he *will* forget.' The same conclusion seems to follow from the rule that ὅπως and ὅφρα may be used with a Future, but not ὥς or ἵνα (Goodwin, § 324). For ὥς in the manner that fits a direct purpose better than ὅπως in some such manner that, or ὅφρα till the time that. It would seem probable, then, that in Final Clauses the Future is a less emphatic and positive expression of end. Thus when Achilles prays (Il. 16. 242), 'embolden him so that Hector will know,' the Future conveys a shade of indifference, as though Hector's knowledge were the natural consequence rather than the direct object. And so in Il. 1. 175 οἳ κέ με τιμήσουσι *who will (I presume) honour me*.

5. In Clauses with εἰ the Future is chiefly used of events regarded as necessary, or as determined by some power independent of the speaker: as—

Il. 14. 61 ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζώμεθ' ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα,
εἰ τι νόος ῥέξει (*if wit is to be of any avail*).

17. 418 εἰ τοῦτον Τρώεσσι μεθήσομεν (*if we are going to give*).
So Il. 1. 61, 294., 5. 350., 12. 248, 249., 13. 375., 15. 162., 24. 57, Od. 2. 115.

We may compare the Conditional Relative Clause—

Il. 23. 753 ὄρνυσθ' οἳ καὶ τοῦτον ἀέθλου πειρήσεσθε
rise, ye that will make trial of this contest.

And with κεν—

Il. 15. 213 αἶ κεν ἄνευ ἐμέθεν . . πεφιδήσεται κτλ.
So Il. 2. 258., 5. 212., 17. 588, Od. 15. 524.

The Imperative.

327.] The Homeric uses of the Imperative present little or no difficulty. We may notice the use in *concession*, ironical or real:—

Il. 4. 29 ἔρδ', ἀτὰρ οὗτοι πάντες ἐπαινέομεν θεοὶ ἄλλοι.

The forms ἄγε and ἄγετε are often combined with other Imperatives for the sake of emphasis: and sometimes ἄγε is treated as indeclinable, and used where the context requires a Plural; as—

Il. 2. 331 ἀλλ' ἄγε μίμνετε πάντες κτλ. (so 1. 62., 6. 376, &c.). Similarly ἴθι is a kind of Interjection in Il. 4. 362 ἀλλ' ἴθι, τὰδ' αὖ δ' ὅπισθεν ἀρессόμεθ' κτλ.: and so we have βάσκ' ἴθι (like εἴπ' ἄγε). And δεῦτε *hither!* is evidently an Imperative: cp. Il. 14. 128 δεῦρ' ἵομεν πόλεμόνδε. The corresponding 2 Sing. doubtless enters into the formation of δεῦρο; but it is not clear how that word is to be analysed.

328.] Prohibition. The Aorist Imperative is very rarely used with μή: examples are—

Il. 4. 410 τῷ μή μοι πατέρας ποθ' ὁμοίῃ ἔνθεο τιμῇ
(so Od. 24. 248 σὺ δὲ μή χόλον ἔνθεο θυμῷ).

18. 134 σὺ μὲν μή πω καταδύσσο μῶλον Ἄρρος.

Od. 16. 301 μή τις ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀκουσάτω.

Il. 16. 200 μή λελαθέσθω.

For the rule which is the complement of this one, forbidding the use of the Present Subj. with μή, see § 278 *fin*.

Regarding the origin of this curious idiom a very probable conjecture has been made by Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 120). In the Veda it has been shown by Grassmann that the prohibitive Particle *mā* is never found with the forms of the Imperative proper, but only with the so-called 'spurious Conjunctive' or 'Injunctive.' Hence it may be inferred that the Imperative was only used originally in *positive* commands, not in prohibitions. Again, it appears that in Sanscrit the Imperative is nearly confined to the Present Tense: and in Greek the forms of the First Aor. Imper. (κλέψον, Mid. κλέψαι) are certainly of late origin. The fine distinction which is made, in the Imperative as well as in other Moods, between the continuous action expressed by the Present Stem and the momentary action expressed by the Aorist belongs to the specific development of Greek. Accordingly Delbrück suggests that the extension of the Imperative to express prohibition took place at a time when the Aorist Imperative had not come into general use: and hence it was only carried into the Present Tense. In other words, the form μή κλέπτε came into use in pre-historic Greek as an extension of the positive κλέπτε, and superseded μή κλέπτῃς: but μή κλέψῃς kept its ground, because the form κλέψον did not then exist. This account of the idiom seems much more probable than any attempt to explain it on psychological grounds.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PARTICLES.

329.] Under the term *Particles* it is convenient to group together a number of words that are mainly used to show the relations between other words, and between Clauses. In respect of this office they are akin to the various syllables or letters used as Endings: and with them go to constitute what are called the 'formal elements' of the language, in contradistinction to the roots or stems which compose its 'matter.'

The Particles which connect successive Clauses in any way form the *Conjunctions*. As such they may be distinguished, according to the nature of the connexion which they indicate,

as *Copulative* (καί, τε, ἡδέ, &c.), *Adversative* (δέ, ἀλλά, αὐτάρ), *Disjunctive* (ἢ—ἥ), *Conditional* (εἰ, ἄν, κεν), *Illative* (ἄρα, δῆ, οὖν), *Causal* (γάρ), &c.

Those Particles, again, which affect single Clauses may either serve to show the character of the whole Clause (as Affirmative, Interrogative, Conditional, &c.), or to influence particular words in it. We cannot, however, make a satisfactory classification of the Particles on the basis of these uses, because some of them are employed in several distinct ways: and moreover they enter into various combinations in which they often acquire new meanings. It will be best therefore to take them separately, beginning with the most familiar.

καί.

330.] The uses of καί are in the main the same in all periods of Greek. It is (1) a Copulative Conjunction, conveying the idea of *addition* to what has preceded: Ζηνὶ φόως ἐρέουσα καὶ ἄλλοις *to Zeus and the others besides*: ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη καὶ κτλ. *thus he spoke and thereupon &c.*: and (2) a strengthening or emphasising Particle meaning *also, even, just*: as—

II. 1. 63 ἢ καὶ ὄνειροπόλον *or even a dream-prophet.*

3. 176 τὸ καὶ κλαίονσα τέτηκα *which is the very reason that I am wasted with weeping.*

It is especially used with words that imply *comparison*, increase or diminution, extension of time or the reverse, &c.; as καὶ ἄλλος *another* (not this only), καὶ αὐτός *himself* (as well as others): καὶ πάλαι *long ago* (not merely now), καὶ αὖθις *another time* (if not now), καὶ μάλα, καὶ λίην (in a *high* degree, not merely in an *ordinary* degree): so with Comparatives, καὶ μείζον, καὶ βίγιον, &c. Both terms of a comparison may be strengthened in this way; as—

II. 1. 81 εἴ περ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ καταπέψῃ,
ἀλλά τε καὶ μετόπισθεν κτλ.

Notice, too, the use at the beginning of an Apodosis, esp. with Adverbs of *time*, as—

II. 1. 477 ἦμος δ' ἡριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος ἠώς,
καὶ τότε ἔπειτ' κτλ.

καί precedes the word which it emphasises, but is sometimes separated from it by other Particles, enclitic Pronouns, &c.: as II. 1. 213 καὶ ποτέ τοι τρίς τόσσα (not merely compensation but) *three times as much*: 2. 292 καὶ γάρ τίς θ' ἕνα μῆνα μένων *a man who stays even one month*. So 7. 281 καὶ ἴδμεν ἅπαντες (= ἴσμεν καὶ πάντες).

καὶ εἰ and εἰ καί. The combination καὶ εἰ indicates that the

whole condition is an extreme one: even on the supposition that—. But with the order εἰ καὶ the καὶ emphasises particular words: εἰ καὶ μάλα καρτερός ἐστι *even if he is* (I will go so far as to say) *very strong*. Hence εἰ καὶ usually implies that the supposition is more or less true.

ΤΕ.

331.] The enclitic τε has two main uses which it is essential to distinguish; besides one or two special uses of less importance.

(a) As a Conjunction τε connects clauses and single words. It is especially used when a new fact or new object is to take its place *pari passu* with what has been already said: κύνεσσιν οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι *to dogs and birds as well*: αἱ πᾶσι κακὸν Τρώεσσι γέγοντο οἱ τ' αὐτῷ *which were a bane to all the Trojans, and to himself* (equally). This meaning is given still more distinctly by the Correlative τε—τε: thus we have the pairs ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, δῆμος τε πόλις τε, κλαγγὴ τ' ἐνοπῇ τε, &c. and the pairs of Clauses expressing *simultaneous* action, such as—

ἄψ τ' ἀνεχώρησεν, ὥχρος τέ μιν εἴλε παρείδς.

Hence τε—τε sometimes marks that two things are *mutually dependent*: ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε = 'not less dear because small,' λυσόμενός τε θυγάτρα φέρων τ' ἀπερείσι' ἀποινα = 'bringing vast ransom for the deliverance of his daughter': Il. 5. 359 κόμισαί τέ με δός τέ μοι ἵππους.

The combinations τε—καὶ and τε—ἤδέ (or ἰδέ) are also common in Homer, and not sensibly different in meaning from τε—τε: as—

ῥμωξέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ὦ πεπλήγετο μηρῶ.
χλαῖνάν τ' ἤδ' ἐχίτωνά.

As to the *place* of τε the general rule is that it follows the first word in the Clause. Hence when standing first in the pair τε—τε it does not always follow the word which it couples: *e.g.* Il. 6. 317 ἐγγύθι τε Πριάμοιο καὶ Ἑκτορος *near both Priam and Hector*; Il. 5. 878 σοί τ' ἐπιπείθονται καὶ δεδμήμεσθα ἕκαστος (*cp.* 2. 136, 198., 4. 505., 7. 294-5).

The use of τε as a Particle of *transition* (to begin a fresh sentence after a pause) is not Homeric, though common in later Greek. This may indicate that the use as a connecting Particle was originally confined to the Correlative τε—τε (Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 145).

332.] (b) In its other use—which is distinctively Homeric—τε serves to mark an assertion as *general* or *indefinite*. Hence it is found in *gnomic* passages: as—

Il. 1. 218 ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπείθεται, μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ.

9. 509 τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὤνησαν καὶ τ' ἔκλυον εὖζαμένιοι.

Od. 6. 185 μάλιστα δέ τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοί.

Π. 16. 688 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τε Διὸς κρείσσων νόος ἢ ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν.

19. 221 αἰψά τε φυλόπιδος πέλεται κόρος (cp. Od. I. 392).

Hes. Th. 87 αἰψά τε καὶ μέγα νείκος ἐπισταμένως κατέπαυσε.

So in many short maxims, such as ῥεχθὲν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω—στρεπτοὶ δέ τε καὶ θεοὶ αὐτοί. In *similes* it is very common, and is often repeated in the successive Clauses; e.g.—

Π. 4. 482 ὁ δ' ἐν κονίησι χαμαὶ πέσεν, αἰγείρος ὥς,
ἢ ῥά τ' ἐν εἰαμενῇ ἔλκος μέγαλοιο πεφύκη
λείη, ἀτάρ τέ οἱ ὄζοι ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῃ πεφύασι·
τὴν μὲν θ' ἄρματοπηγὸς ἀνὴρ αἰθῶνι σιδήρῳ
ἔξέταμ', ὄφρα κτλ.

16. 156 οἱ δὲ λύκοι ὥς
ᾠμοφάγοι, τοῖσιν τε περὶ φρεσὶν ἄσπετος ἀλκή,
οἳ τ' ἔλαφον κεραδὸν μέγαν οὔρεσι δηώσαντες
δάπτουσιν· πᾶσιν δὲ παρήϊον αἵματι φοινόν·
καὶ τ' ἀγελήδων ἴασιν ἀπὸ κρήνης μελανύδρου
λάφοντες γλώσσησιν ἀραιῇσιν μέλαν ὕδωρ
ἄκρον, ἐρευνόμενοι φόνον αἵματος· ἐν δέ τε θυμὸς
στήθεσιν ἄτρομός ἐστι, περιστένεται δέ τε γαστήρ.

So where the meaning is frequentative:—

Od. 4. 102 ἄλλοτε μὲν τε γόφῳ φρένα τέρπομαι (cp. 5. 55., 12. 64).

Π. 19. 86 καὶ τέ με νεικέεσκον (20. 28, Od. 5. 331, &c.).

So Π. 1. 521 νεικεῖ καὶ τέ μέ φησι κτλ. and says (habitually) that I &c.: cp. 9. 410., 17. 174, Od. 1. 215., 4. 387., 10. 330., 17. 25. Hence it is used of *names*, as Π. 1. 403 ἀνδρες δέ τε πάντες (καλέουσι), 2. 814., 5. 306, &c.; of characteristic attributes, as—

Π. 2. 453 οὐδ' ὃ γε Πηνειῷ συμμίσγεται . .
ἀλλὰ τέ μιν καθύπερθεν ἐπιρρέει ἡὺτ' ἔλαιον.

5. 340 ἰχώρ, οἷός περ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσι.

And generally of any fixed condition of things, as Π. 4. 247 ἐνθα τε νῆες εἰρύατ' εὐπρυμνοί: 5. 477 οἳ περ τ' ἐπίκουροι ἐνεμειν: 15. 187 τρεῖς γάρ τ' ἐκ Κρόνου εἰμὲν ἀδελφεοί (a fact of permanent significance): 22. 116 ἢ τ' ἐπλετο νείκεος ἀρχή. It may be laid down as a general rule that τε in the combinations μὲν τε, δέ τε, καὶ τε, γάρ τε, ἀλλὰ τε, and the like, is not a Conjunction, and does not affect the meaning of the Conjunction which it follows.

In a Conditional sentence of gnomic character the τε is often used in both members, as—

Π. 1. 81 εἴ περ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ κατεπέψῃ,
ἀλλὰ τε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχει κότον.

The use with the Article and the different forms of the Relative has been already discussed in the chapter on the Pronouns (see §§ 263, 266). It was there pointed out that τε is used when the Clause serves to describe a *class*, as—

ἄγρια πάντα, τὰ τε τρέφει οὔρεσιν ὕλη.
 ρεία δ' ἀρίγνωτος γόνος ἀνέρος ᾧ τε Κρονίων κτλ.

or to express a permanent characteristic, as—

γῆρας καὶ θάνατος, τὰ τ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλονται.
 χόλος, ὅς τ' ἐφέηκε πολύφρονά περ χαλεπῆναι.
 Λωτοφάγων, οἷ τ' ἀνθινον εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν.

So ὥς τε, ὅτε τε, ἵνα τε, ἔνθα τε, ὅσος τε, οἷός τε, ὥς εἰ τε, &c. Of these ὥς τε (or ὥστε) and οἷός τε, with the adverbial ἄτε and ἐφ' ᾧ τε, are the only forms in which this use of τε has remained in Attic Greek. ἐπεὶ τε, which is regular in Herodotus, is rare in Homer: see Il. 11. 87, 562., 12. 393.

Further, the Indefinite τις is not unfrequently strengthened in its meaning (*any one*) by τε (cp. Latin *quisque*):—

Il. 3. 12 τόσσον τίς τ' ἐπιλεύσσει ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ λᾶαν ἴησιν.

14. 90 σίγα, μή τίς τ' ἄλλος . . ἀκούσῃ (so Od. 19. 486).

So καὶ γάρ τίς τε, καὶ μὲν τίς τε, and in Relative Clauses, ὅς τίς τε, ὅτε τίς τε, ὥς τίς τε, &c.: also ἦν τίς τε (Od. 5. 120).

Notice also the use with the disjunctive ἢ after a Comparative, in Od. 16. 216 ἀδυνώτερον ἢ τ' οἰωνοί. This is akin to the use in similes. So in Il. 4. 277 μελάντερον ἥ τε πίσσα *blacker than pitch*. The true reading is probably ἡέ τε, as was suggested by Bekker (*H. B.* i. p. 312): see however Buttmann, *Lexil.*, s. v. ἥ τε. On ἦ τε—ἦ τε *either—or* see § 340.

The two uses of τε may sometimes be distinguished by its place in the sentence. Thus τε is a Conjunction in Il. 2. 522 οἷ τ' ἄρα *and who*—(cp. εἰ τ' ἄρα, οὔτ' ἄρα), and in Il. 23. 277 ἀδυνατοί τε γάρ εἰσι κτλ.; also in the combinations οὔτε τις, μήτε τις. With the indefinite τε we should have the order ἄρα τε, γάρ τε, τίς τε. Both uses may even occur in the same clause; as Il. 5. 89 τὸν δ' οὔτ' ἄρ τε γέφυραι ἐεργμέναι ἰσχανόωσιν.*

The places in which τε appears to be used in statements of single or definite facts can generally be corrected without difficulty. In several places δέ τ' (οὐδέ τ', μηδέ τ') has crept into the text instead of δ' ἔτ'. Thus we find—

Il. 1. 406 τὸν καὶ ὑπέδεισαν μάκαρες θεοὶ οὐδέ τ' ἔδησαν
 (Read οὐδ' ἔτ',—*they no longer bound, gave up binding*).

2. 179 ἀλλ' ἴθι νῦν κατὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν μηδέ τ' ἐρώει.
 (Read μηδ' ἔτ' with four of La Roche's MSS.).

11. 437 οὐδέ τ' ἔασε
 (Read οὐδ' ἔτ' with the *Lipsiensis*, and so in Il. 21. 596).

* The account now given of the uses of τε was suggested (in substance) by Dr. Wentzel, whose dissertation (*Ueber den Gebrauch der Partikel τε bei Homer*, Glogau, 1847) appears to have been overlooked by subsequent writers.

Il. 23. 474 αἱ δέ τ' ἀνευθεν

(Read αἱ δ' ἔτ' with the *Townleianus*).

Similarly we should read οὐδ' ἔτ' in Il. 15. 709., 17. 42., 21. 248., 22. 300., 23. 622, 730., 24. 52, Od. 12. 198. In such a matter manuscript authority is evidently of no weight, and it will be found that the MSS. often have δέ τ' where the editors have already corrected δ' ἔτ' (e.g. in Il. 1. 573., 2. 344., 12. 106, Od. 2. 115., 11. 380., 21. 186., 24. 401). In Il. 11. 767 the editions have νῶϊ δέ τ' ἔνδον, but all MSS. νῶϊ δὲ ἔνδον: so perhaps we may correct Il. 21. 456 νῶϊ δέ τ' ἀψορροὶ κίομεν. Perhaps ἔτι should be restored in Il. 16. 836 σὲ δέ τ' ἐνθάδε γῦπες ἔδονται, Od. 15. 428 πέρασαν δέ τε δεῦρ' ἀγαγόντες.

Two isolated Epic uses remain to be noticed:—

(1) After an Interrogative in the combination τ' ἄρα, τ' ἄρ: as—

Il. 1. 8 τίς τ' ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;

18. 188 πῶς τ' ἄρ' ἴω μετὰ μῶλον; (so πῇ τ' ἄρ Il. 13. 307).

Od. 1. 346 μῆτερ ἐμή, τί τ' ἄρα φθονέεις κτλ.

The ancient grammarians regarded τὰρ as a single enclitic Particle (so Herodian, Schol. Il. 1. 65). As the force of the τε seems to have merged in the compound, this is probably right: just as γ' ἄρ having become a single Particle is written γάρ. But if so, we must also recognise the form τὰρα.

(2) With ἦ in strong Affirmation: as ἦ τ' ἐφάμην *I did indeed think*. This may originally belong to the same head as the indefinite use: ἦ τε = *surely anyhow*. But a distinct force of the τε is no longer perceptible.

The Latin *que*, which is originally identical with τε, shows the same separation into two main uses. In the use as a Conjunction the agreement between τε and *que* is close. It is less so in the other use, chiefly because τε in Homer is still a distinct word, whereas *que* in Latin is confined to certain combinations, viz. *at-que*, *nam-que* (cp. καὶ τε, ἀλλὰ τε, γάρ τε, &c.), *ita-que*, the Indefinite *quisque* (with the corresponding forms *ubique*, *quandoque*, *uterque*, &c.), and the Relative *quicunque*. The two uses are also united in the Sanscrit *ca*, which as a connecting Particle agrees closely with τε, and is also found after the Indefinite *kas*, especially in the combination *yāh kās ca* (ὅς τίς τε). See Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 144, *A. S.* § 284.

δε.

333.] The chief use of the Adversative Particle δε is to show that a Clause stands in some *contrast* to what has preceded. Ordinarily, however, it merely indicates the continuation of a narrative (*i.e.* shows that the new fact is not *simultaneous*). It is especially used to introduce a parenthesis or subordinate statement (whereas τε introduces something parallel or coordinate: *c. g.*—

νοῦσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὥρσε κακὴν, ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοί,
οὕνεκα κτλ.

Here a prose writer would say *ὀλεθρίαν*, or *ὥστε ἀπόλλυσθαι τὸν λαόν*, or *ὕφ' ἧς ὁ λαὸς ἀπώλλυτο*, &c. So—

Ἀντίλοχος δὲ Μύδωνα βάλ', ἥνιχον θεράποντα,
ἔσθλ' Ἀτρυμιάδην, ὃ δ' ὑπέστρεφε μώνυχας ἵππους,
χερμαδίῳ ἀγκῶνα τυχὼν μέσον.

I. e. 'struck him as he was turning the horses.'

δέ is nearly always the *second* word in the Clause. It is occasionally put after (1) a Preposition and Case-form, as ἐπ' αὐτῶν δ' ὠμοθέτησαν, or (2) an Article and Numeral, as τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' κτλ.: but not after other combinations. Hence καὶ δέ, as Il. 7. 113 καὶ δ' Ἀχιλεὺς and even *Achilles* (never καὶ Ἀχιλεὺς δέ, as in later Greek).

334.] δέ of the Apodosis. While δέ generally stands at the beginning of a new independent Sentence, there are certain uses, especially in Homer, in which it marks the beginning of the principal Clause after a Relativial, Temporal or Conditional Protasis. This is found where there is an *opposition* of some kind between the two members of the Sentence: *e. g.*—

Il. 4. 261 εἴ περ γάρ τ' ἄλλοι γε κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ
δαιτρὸν πίνωσιν, σὺν δὲ πλείον δέπας κτλ. (so Il. 2. 245).

5. 260 αἶ κέν μοι πολύβουλος Ἀθήνη κῶδος ὀρέξῃ
ἀμφοτέρω κτείναι, σὺν δὲ . . ἐρυκακέειν κτλ.

Od. 7. 108 ὅσσον Φαίηκες περὶ πάντων ἱδρῖες ἀνδρῶν
νῆα θοῇν ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἐλαυνέμεν, ὥς δὲ γυναιῖκες
ἱστὸν τεχνῆσαι (cp. Od. 14. 178, 405., 18. 62).

With οὐ and μή, giving οὐδέ, μηδέ, as—

Il. 5. 788 ὄφρα μὲν ἐς πόλεμον πωλέσκετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,
οὐδέ ποτε Τρῶες κτλ.

6. 58 μηδ' οὐ τινα γαστέρι μήτηρ
κοῦρον ἐόντα φέροι, μηδ' ὅς φύγοι.

Od. 1. 16 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἔτος ἦλθε . . οὐδ' ἔνθα κτλ.

10. 17 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ ἐγὼ ὁδὸν ἤτεον . . οὐδέ τι κείνος κτλ.

This use, which was called by the ancient grammarians the *δέ ἀποδοτικόν*, or 'δέ of the apodosis,' has been variously explained by scholars.

1. In many places the Clause introduced by this δέ stands in a double opposition, first to the immediate protasis, and then to a preceding sentence. Thus in—

Il. 2. 716 οἱ δ' ἄρα Μηθώνην . . ἐνέμοντο,
τῶν δὲ Φιλοκτῆτης ἦρχεν κτλ.

Philoctetes is opposed as commander to the people of Methone, and the whole statement is opposed to the previously mentioned peoples with their commanders. So in a period composed of two pairs of correlated Clauses, as—

II. 1. 135 ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν δώσουσι γέρας . .

εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώωσιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι.

9. 508 ὃς μὲν τ' αἰδέσεται κόυρας Διὸς ἄσπον ἰούσας,

τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὤνησαν καὶ τ' ἔκλυον εὐχομένοιο·

ὃς δέ κ' ἀνήγεται καὶ τε στερεῶς ἀποείπη,

λίσσονται δ' ἄρα ταί γε Δία κτλ.

Here the δέ of the last Clause appears to carry on the opposition of the second pair to the first, and so to repeat the δέ of its own protasis. This use of δέ in apodosis to repeat or carry on the opposition of the whole sentence is regular in Attic; *e.g.* Xen. Anab. 5. 6, 20 εἰ δὲ βούλεσθε . . πλοῖα δ' ὑμῖν παρέσσι: Isocr. 4. 98 ἃ δ' ἐστὶν ἴδια . . ταῦτα δ' ἐμὸν ἔργον ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν (Kühner, § 533, 2). It has been regarded as the key to the Homeric usage now in question: * but this would compel us in many cases to give different explanations of uses to which the same explanation is evidently applicable. For instance, in the four lines last quoted, if we account for the δέ of λίσσονται δ' ἄρα κτλ. as a repetition of the δέ of its protasis ὃς δέ κ' κτλ., how do we treat the δέ of the first apodosis (τὸν δὲ κτλ.)? The two forms are essentially similar.

2. The δέ of the Apodosis is commonly regarded as a survival from a period in which the Relative Clause or Conditional Protasis was not yet subordinate, so that the Apodosis, if it followed the other, still needed or at least admitted of a connecting Particle. Such an explanation is attractive because it presents us with a case of the general law according to which the complex sentence or period is formed by the welding together of originally distinct simple sentences.† It is to be observed, however, that the phenomenon in question is not necessarily more than a particular use of δέ. The survival may be, not of a paratactic form of sentence, but only of a use of δέ where it is not a Conjunction. Such a use has been already seen in the Particle καί. In the correlation ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ—καὶ τότε δὴ we need find nothing

* So in the first edition of this book, following the discussion of Nägelsbach in his *Anmerkungen zur Ilias* (p. 261 and p. 271, ed. 1834). The Excursus on the subject was omitted in later editions. For the view adopted in the text the author is indebted almost wholly to Dr. R. Nieberding, *Ueber die parataktische Anknüpfung des Nachsatzes in hypotaktischen Satzgefügen, insbesondere bei Homer*, Gross-Glogau, 1882.

† On the danger of explaining the Syntax of complex sentences by recourse to a supposed survival of paratactic structure there is a timely warning given by Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* § 203.

more than the ordinary use of *καί* with the meaning *also, even*; that is to say, it emphasises the *sequence* of the apodosis, just as it often emphasises single words or phrases. Similarly *δέ* may have been used to mark the *adversative* character of an apodosis.

3. These points may be illustrated by the parallel between *καί* *also, even* and *οὐδέ* or *μηδέ* = *not even, also not*. In this use *δέ* is clearly not a Conjunction, but merely serves to mark the natural opposition between the negative and some preceding affirmation (expressed or implied). Thus it is closely akin to the use in apodosis, the difference being only that it belongs to a single word rather than a Clause.

4. It is a confirmation of this view that among the cases of *δέ* in the apodosis we never find one in which the protasis is introduced by the corresponding *μέν*.* Where this is apparently the case it will be found that the *μέν* refers forward, not to the *δέ* of the immediate apodosis, but to a new sentence with *δέ* or some equivalent Particle: *e.g.*—

Il. 2. 188 *ὃν τινα μὲν βασιλῆα καὶ ἕξοχον ἄνδρα κιχείη,*
τὸν δ' ἀγαυοῖς ἐπέεσσιν κτλ.
ὃν δ' αὖ δῆμον τ' ἄνδρα ἴδοι κτλ.

where the correspondence is not *ὃν μὲν—τὸν δέ*—, but *ὃν μὲν—ὃν δ' αὖ*—. See also Il. 9. 508, 550., 12. 10., 18. 257., 20. 41, Od. 9. 56., 11. 147., 19. 329.

It has been observed that when the Protasis is a Relative Clause, *δέ* of the Apodosis is generally found after a Demonstrative. The only exceptions to this rule are, Il. 9. 510 *ὅς δέ κ' ἀνήγεται . . λίσσονται δ' ἄρα ταί γε κτλ.*, and Il. 23. 319 *ἀλλ' ὅς μὲν θ' ἵπποισι . . ἵπποι δέ πλανῶνται κτλ.* (Schömann, *Opusc. Acad.* ii. p. 97.)

335.] **Enclitic δέ.** There are two uses which may be noticed under this heading:—

(1) The *δε* of *δ-δε*, *τόσσο-δε*, *τοῖόσ-δε* is properly an Enclitic (as the accent shows).

The form *τοῖς-δεσι* or *τοῖς-δεσσι* may be a trace of an inflected Pronoun akin to *δέ* (related to it perhaps as *τις* to *τε*); or it may be merely a form created by the analogy of other Datives in *-εσσι*, *-εσι*.

(2) The *δε* which is suffixed to Accusatives expressing *motion* *to* is generally treated as an Enclitic in respect of accent: as *οἰκόνδε*, *πόλεμόνδε*. The ancient grammarians, however, wrote *δέ* as a distinct orthotone word, hence *οἶκον δέ*, *πόλεμον δέ*, &c. (but *οἶκαδε*, *φύγαδε* were made exceptions).

* Nieberding, *op. cit.* p. 4.

It seems likely that the -δε of these two uses is originally the same. The force in both cases is that of a *local* Adverb. Whether it is to be identified with the Conjunction δέ is a further question.

ἀλλά, αὐτάρ, ἄτάρ, αὖ, αὖτε.

336.] The remaining Adversative Particles do not need much explanation.

ἀλλά and αὐτάρ are used (like δέ) in the apodosis, especially after a Clause with εἰ περ : as—

Il. I. 81 εἰ περ γάρ τε . . ἀλλά τε (cp. 8. 153., 19. 164).

22. 390 εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ . . αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κτλ.

αὐτάρ and ἄτάρ express a slighter opposition than ἀλλά, and accordingly are often used as Particles of transition ; *e.g.* in such formulae as ὧς οἱ μὲν . . αὐτὰρ κτλ. A similar use of ἀλλά may be seen with Imperatives ; as ἀλλ' ἴθι, ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπέ, and the like. It is evident that the stronger Adversative is chosen where greater *liveliness* of tone is to be conveyed.

337.] αὖ and αὖτε (*again, on the contrary*) have nearly the same force as αὐτάρ, but do not begin the sentence : hence νῦν αὖ, τίς δ' αὖ, τίπι' αὖτε, &c. : and so in correspondence to μέν or ἤ τοι, as Il. 4. 237 τῶν ἤ τοι . . ἡμεῖς αὖτε κτλ. They also serve to mark the apodosis of a Relative or Conditional Clause, as Il. 4. 321 εἰ τότε κοῦρος ἔα, νῦν αὖτέ με γῆρας ὀπάξει. Thus they have the two chief uses of δέ.

Originally, doubtless, αὖ meant *backwards*, but in Homer this sense is only found in the form αὖτις : though perhaps it survives in the sacrificial word ἀνέρυσαν.

The form ὄμως is later, the Homeric word being ἔμπης.

ὄμως is usually read in Il. 12. 393 ὄμως δ' οὐ λήθεο χάρμης, and Od. 11. 565 ἐνθα χ' ὄμως προσέφη. In both places however the Scholia indicate that the word was anciently circumflexed by some authorities.

ἦ.

338.] The Particle ἦ at the beginning of a sentence gives it the character of a strong *affirmation* :—

Il. I. 240 ἦ ποτ' Ἀχιλλῆος ποθὴ ἕξεται *be sure that one day &c.*
So, with an ironical tone,—

Il. I. 229 ἦ πολλὸν λώϊόν ἐστι κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν
δῶρ' ἀποιεῖσθαι κτλ.

It is often used *interrogatively*, esp. in questions of surprise indignation, irony, &c. : as—

Il. 2. 229 ἦ ἔτι καὶ χρυσοῦ ἐπιδύεαι κτλ.

15. 504 ἡ ἐλπεςθ' ἦν νῆας ἔλη κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ
ἐμβαδὸν ἵζεσθαι κτλ. (*do you really hope &c.*).

Od. 3. 312 ἡ οὐχ ἄλις ὥς κτλ. (*is it not—? = surely it is*): cp.
§ 358, c.

Occasionally, in short parenthetical sentences, ἦ has a *concessive* force, *it is true that*, hence *and yet, although*: as—

Il. 3. 214 παῖρα μὲν, ἀλλὰ μάλα λιγέως, ἐπεὶ οὐ πολὺμυθος,
οὐδ' ἀφαρμαρτοεπής· ἡ καὶ γένει ὕστερος ἦεν.

7. 393 οὐ φησιν δώσειν· ἡ μὲν Τρῳῆς γε κέλονται (§ 344).

11. 362 ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔφυγε θάνατον, κύον· ἡ τέ τοι ἄγχι
ἦλθε κακόν (so 18. 13).

22. 280 ἡ τοι ἐφην γε (= *though I did think*; so 22. 280).

The question whether ἦ (or ἧ) can be used to introduce a Dependent Interrogative depends upon a few passages. Bekker favours ἦ in this use, and reads accordingly, e. g. Il. 1. 83 σὺ δὲ φράσαι ἡ με σώσεις. The majority of the editors recognise it in three or four places:—

Il. 8. 111 εἴσεται ἡ καὶ ἐμὸν δόρυ μαίνεται κτλ.

Od. 13. 415 ὄχρετο πεινσόμενος μετὰ σὸν κλέος, ἧ που ἔτ' εἴης.

16. 137 ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἄτρεκέως κατὰλεξον,
ἡ καὶ Λαέρτη αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἄγγελος ἔλθω.

19. 325 πῶς γὰρ ἐμεῦ σύ, ξείνε, δαήσεται, ἧ τι γυναικῶν
ἀλλᾶν περίεμι;

In all these places, however, there is manuscript support for εἰ, and so La Roche reads in the two last. For the use of εἰ with the Subj. see § 294, with the Opt. § 314. It is difficult to derive the use of ἧ which Bekker supposes either from the emphatic ἦ, or from the disjunctive ἢ or ἧ (*Hom. Bl.* p. 59). In any case there is no sufficient ground for deserting the MSS.

ἦ is often combined more or less closely with other Particles: as ἦ τε (§ 332, 2), ἦ μάν, &c. (§§ 343–5), ἦ τοι (or ἦτοι), ἦδη (for ἦ δῆ), and the correlative ἦμὲν—ἦδέ. In these combinations ἦ strengthens the other Particle. Note that—

ἦμὲν—ἦδέ are used of slightly opposed things, especially when *alternation* is implied: as—

Od. 2. 68 λίσσομαι ἦμὲν Ζηνὸς Ὀλυμπίου ἦδὲ Θέμιστος,
ἦ τ' ἀνδρῶν ἀγορὰς ἦμὲν λύει ἦδὲ καθίζει·

i. e. 'assembles and dissolves again in turn' (Lat. *tum—tum*). Cp. Il. 8. 395 ἦμὲν ἀνακλίνει . . ἦδ' ἐπιθείνει: and so Il. 7. 301, Od. 1. 97., 8. 383, and probably Il. 6. 149 ἦμὲν φύει ἦδ' ἀπολήγει. The original emphasis may sometimes be traced, as in the formula Il. 14. 234 ἦμὲν δῆ ποτ' ἐμὸν ἔπος ἔκλυες ἦδ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν πείθεις *surely you have heard me before, and even so listen now*.

ἦδέ is also used (= *and*) without a preceding ἦμὲν: but not to begin a fresh sentence. Cp. § 331 *fin.* for the similar use of τε.

339.] ἦ after τί, ἐπεὶ. In most editions of Homer we find the

forms *τή* (or *τιή*) and *ἐπειή*, which are evidently *τί*, *ἐπεί* with a suffix *-η* of an affirmative or emphasising kind.

The ancient grammarians seem generally to have considered this *η* as a distinct word. They lay down the rule that after *ἐπεί* it is circumflexed, after *τί* oxytone. The form *ἐπεί* *ῆ* is supported by the fact that it is chiefly found in the combination *ἐπεί ῆ πολλὸν* κτλ. (Il. 1. 169., 4. 56, 307, &c.); also with *μάλα* (Il. 1. 156 *ἐπεί ῆ μάλα πολλὰ μεταξὺ* κτλ., Od. 10. 465 *ἐπεί ῆ μάλα πολλὰ πέπασθε*, cp. *ῆ μάλα*, Il. 17. 34), and *καί* (Il. 20. 437, Od. 16. 442).

The case of *τί* is different. There is no ground for writing *τί ῆ* (like *ἐπεί ῆ*). The form *τί ῆ*, which is adopted by the most recent editors on the authority of the ancients, is not satisfactory. If this *ῆ* was originally the affirmative *ῆ*, the change of accent would indicate that it had lost its character as a separate word. And this is confirmed by the combination *τί ῆ δὲ σὺν* κτλ. (Il. 6. 55, &c.), which as now written is contrary to the general rule for the place of *δέ*. Moreover the ancients were not unanimous on the point, since Trypho wrote *τίη* in one word (Apollonius, *de Conj.* p. 523).

It may be observed that the opinion of the grammarians as to *τή* has more weight than in the case of *ἐπεί ῆ*, since *τή* and *δουή* were Attic. We may suspect therefore that the accentuation *ἐπεί ῆ* rests on mere inference.

With *τή* is to be placed the emphatic Nom. *τὴν-η* *θῆου*, a form which occurs in the *Iliad* only (cp. the Doric *ἐγών-η*).

ῆέ, *ῆ*.

340.] *ῆέ* and *ῆ* are used in Homer as equivalent forms of the same Particle: which is (1) Disjunctive (*or*) and (2) used after Comparatives (*than*).

The use of the Correlative *ῆέ* (*ῆ*)—*ῆέ* (*ῆ*)=*either—or* is also common in Homer: as Il. 1. 504 *ῆ ἔπει ῆ ἔργω*; 3. 239 *ῆ οὐχ ἐσπέσθην . . ῆ δεύρω μὲν ἔποντο* κτλ.

When a question is asked in a disjunctive form, the accent of the Particle *ῆέ*, *ῆ* is thrown back, *i. e.* it is written *ῆε* or *ῆι*:—

Il. 13. 251 *ῆέ τι βέβληται, βέλεος δέ σε τείρει ἀκωκή,*
ῆέ τευ ἀγγελίης μετ' ἔμ' ἥλυθες;

Od. 4. 362 *Ἀντίνο', ῆ ῥά τι ἴδμεν ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ῆε καὶ οὐκί*;

So when the first part of the question is not introduced by a Particle; Il. 10. 534 *ψεύσομαι ῆ ἔτυμον ἐρέω*; *shall I speak falsehood or the truth?* Od. 1. 226 *εἰλαπίνῃ ῆε γάμος*; cp. 4. 314, 372. Indeed the first half of the sentence need not be interrogative; as Od. 21. 193 *ἔπος τί κε μυθησάμεν, ῆ αὐτὸς κεύθω*;

I would say a word ; or shall I keep it to myself ? (so perhaps Il. 14. 190).

One of the members of a disjunctive question may be itself Disjunctive: *e.g.*—

Il. 6. 377 $\pi\eta\ \xi\beta\eta\ \text{'}\text{Ανδρομάχη λευκώλενος ἐκ μεγάροιο ;}$
 $\eta\acute{\epsilon}\ \pi\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\ \gammaαλῶν\ \eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\iotaνατέρων\ \acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\piέπλων,$
 $\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\ \text{'}\text{Αθηναίης}\ \acute{\epsilon}\xiοίχεται\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$

Here $\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\iotaνατέρων$ offers an alternative for $\gammaαλῶν$, but the main question is between these two alternatives on one side and $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\ \text{'}\text{Αθηναίης}\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$ on the other.

Most editors of Homer recognise an *interrogative* use of the form $\eta\epsilon$, but erroneously.* The questions in which $\eta\epsilon$ is found are all *disjunctive*, so that we must write $\eta\acute{\epsilon}$ — $\eta\epsilon$ (Il. 6. 378., 13. 251., 15. 735., 16. 12, 13, 17, Od. 1. 408., 2. 30., 11. 399). In—

Od. 13. 233 $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\ ;\ \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \delta\eta\muος\ ;\ \tau\acute{\iota}\nuες\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rhoες\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\sigmaιν\ ;$
 $\eta\ \pi\acute{o}\upsilon\ \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \nu\eta\sigma\omegaν\ \acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\lambdaος,\ \eta\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\tau\eta\ |\ \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\theta'\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$

$\eta\ \pi\acute{o}\upsilon$ means *surely methinks*: the sense being, 'what land is this? It must be some island or else promontory.' Hence we should read $\eta\acute{\epsilon}$ in the last clause, not $\eta\epsilon$ (as Ameis, &c.).

$\eta\acute{\epsilon}$ or η = *than* is found after Comparatives ; also after Verbs implying comparison, as $\beta\acute{o}\upsilon\lambdaομαι$ *I prefer*, $\phi\theta\acute{\alpha}\nuω$ *I come sooner*.

The correlative $\eta\ \tau\epsilon$ — $\eta\ \tau\epsilon$ appears in three places, viz. Il. 9. 276 $\eta\ \tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\nuδρῶν\ \eta\ \tau\epsilon\ \gammaυναικῶν$ (where it seems to be = $\eta\acute{\mu}\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ — $\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$), 11. 410 $\eta\ \tau'\ \xi\beta\lambda\eta\tau'\ \eta\ \tau'\ \xi\beta\alpha\lambda'\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambdaον$, and 17. 42 $\eta\ \tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\eta\varsigma\ \eta\ \tau\epsilon\ \phi\acute{o}\betaοιο$ (where however Aristarchus read $\eta\delta$ — $\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$). The single η $\tau\epsilon$ occurs with the meaning *or* in Il. 19. 148 $\eta\ \tau'\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\acute{\epsilon}\muεν\ \piαρά\ σοί$: and with the meaning *than* in Od. 16. 216 (§ 332). Considering the general difficulty of deciding between $\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ and η in the text of Homer, we cannot regard the form $\eta\ \tau\epsilon$ as resting on good evidence : see the next section.

341.] Dependent Interrogative Clauses. A Disjunctive question after a Verb of *asking, saying, knowing, &c.* is generally expressed by the Correlatives $\eta\acute{\epsilon}$ (η)— $\eta\epsilon$ (η) : as—

Od. 1. 174 $\kappaαί\ μοι\ τούτ'\ \acute{\alpha}\gammaόρευσον\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\tau\upsilon\muον,\ \delta\phi\rho'\ \acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\iotaδῶ,$
 $\eta\acute{\epsilon}\ \nuέον\ μεθέπεις,\ \eta\ \kappaαί\ πατρώϊός\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigmaσι\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$

Il. 2. 99 $\tau\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon\ \phiίλοι\ \kappaαί\ μείνατ'\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\ \chiρόνον,\ \delta\phi\rhoα\ \deltaαῶμεν,$
 $\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilonδν\ Κάλχας\ μαντεύεται,\ \eta\epsilon\ \kappaαί\ οὐκί.$

Other examples have been given in the account of the Subjunc-

* This has been well shown by Dr. Praetorius, in a dissertation to which I am largely indebted (*Der homerische Gebrauch von η (ηε) in Fragesätzen*, Cassel, 1873). The rule as to the accentuation in a disjunctive question rests upon the unanimous testimony of the ancient grammarians, and is now generally adopted. The MSS. and the older editors give $\eta\acute{\epsilon}$ or η only.

tive (§ 280) and the Optative (§ 302). In general it will be seen that these Dependent Clauses are the same in form as the corresponding direct questions.

In a very few instances the first member of a sentence of this kind is without *ἢ* (§ 302): as—

Od. 4. 109 οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν | ζῶει ὃ γ' ἢ τέθυγκε (4. 837., II. 464).
So II. 10. 544 εἴπ' ἄγε . . ὅππως τοῦσδ' ἵππους λάβετον, καταδύντες
ὀμίλου Τρώων, ἢ τίς σφωε πόρεν κτλ., Od. 4. 643.

The combination εἰ—ἢ (ἢ) is often found in the MSS. of Homer; see II. 2. 367., 8. 532, Od. 4. 28, 712, 789., 16. 238, 260., 17. 308., 18. 265., 24. 217. La Roche (following Bekker) reads ἢ—ἢ (ἢ) in all these places.

The common texts have in one place εἰ τε—ἢ,

II. 2. 349 γινώμεναι εἰ τε ψεύδους ὑπόσχεσις ἢε καὶ οὐκί.

In this instance, if the reading is right, there is a slight irregularity: the speaker beginning as if he meant to use εἰ τε—εἰ τε, and changing to the familiar ἢε καὶ οὐκί. But the best MSS. have εἰ τε—εἰ τε.

A change of construction may also be seen in Od. 24. 235–8 μερμήριξε . . κῦσσαι καὶ περιφῶναι . . ἢ πρῶτ' ἐξέρεοιτο *he debated about embracing &c., or should he first ask &c.*

μάν, μῆν, μέν.

342.] The three words μάν, μῆν, μέν agree so nearly in meaning and usage that they are to be regarded as etymologically connected, if not merely varieties of the same original form. The two former (with the long *ā*, *η*) express strong affirmation (= *surely, indeed, &c.*). The shorter form μέν is also originally a Particle of affirmation, but has acquired derivative uses of which the chief are: (1) the concessive use, preparing us for a Clause with an Adversative δέ, *αὐτάρ*, *ἀλλά*, &c.: and (2) the use in the second of two Clauses with the meaning *yet, nevertheless*.

Taking the generally received text of Homer, we find that μάν occurs 24 times, and that there are only two places in which it is not followed by a vowel. The exceptions are, II. 5. 895 ἀλλ' οὐ μάν σ' ἐτι θηρὸν ἀνέξομαι ἄλγε' ἔχοντα, where μάν may be due to the parallel II. 17. 41 ἀλλ' οὐ μάν ἐτι θηρὸν ἀπείρητος πόνος ἔσται, and II. 5. 765 ἄγρει μάν οἱ (*i. e.* *Foi*) ἔπορσον κτλ. (cp. II. 7. 459 ἄγρει μάν ὄτ' ἂν κτλ.). On the other hand μῆν, which occurs 10 times, is followed by a consonant in every place except II. 19. 45 καὶ μῆν οἱ τότε γ' εἰς ἀγορὴν ἴσαν. These facts have not yet been satisfactorily explained. Bekker in his second edition (1858) wrote μῆν throughout for μάν, and sought to distinguish μῆν and μέν as far as the metre allowed according to Attic usage (*H. B.* pp. 34, 62). Cobet on the contrary proposed to restore μέν for μῆν (*Misc. Crit.* p. 365), and so far as these two forms are concerned his view is probable enough. But how are we to explain the peculiar facts as to μάν? We can hardly account for it except as a genuine Homeric form, and such a form must have been used before consonants as well as vowels. If so, we

can only suppose that an original μάν was changed into μέν whenever it came before a consonant, and preserved when the metre made this corruption impossible.

It is to be observed also that μάν and μήν are almost confined to the Iliad, in which μάν occurs 22 times and μήν 7 times. In the Odyssey μάν is found twice, viz. in II. 344., 17. 470., and μήν three times, in II. 582, 593., 16. 440 (= II. 23. 410). It appears then that μέν is the only form which really belongs to the language of the Odyssey. Consequently the substitution of μέν for μάν in the Iliad may have taken place very early. The change of μέν to μήν probably belongs to the later period when μήν had been established in Ionic and Attic prose.

343.] μάν has an affirmative and generally a hortatory or interjectional force: as in ἀγρει μάν *come!* (II. 5. 765., 7. 459), and ἦ μάν, οὐ μάν, used when a speech begins in a tone of surprise, triumph, or the like; as—

II. 2. 370 ἦ μάν αὐτ' ἀγορή νικᾶς, γέρον, υἷας Ἀχαιῶν.

12. 318 οὐ μάν ἀκληεῖς Λυκίην κατά κοιρανέουσιν
ἡμέτεροισι βασιλῆες (cp. 4. 512., 13. 414., 14. 454, &c.).

An approach to the force of an emphatic *yet* appears in—

II. 8. 373 ἔσται μάν δτ' ἂν αὐτε φλήην γλαυκῶπιδα εἶπη.

and in ἀλλ' οὐ μάν (II. 5. 895., 17. 41, 418, &c.), μὴ μάν (II. 8. 512., 15. 476., 22. 304).

344.] μήν with a hortatory force occurs in II. 1. 302 εἰ δ' ἄγε μὴν πείρησαι *come, do but try*. The combination ἦ μήν is affirmative (rather than merely *concessive*),—not so much admitting as insisting upon an objection or reply: II. 2. 291 ἦ μὴν καὶ πόνος ἐστὶ *it is true enough that there is toil*: 7. 393 ἦ μὴν Τρῶες γε κέλονται *I assure you that the Trojans bid him*: 9. 57 ἦ μὴν καὶ νέος ἐσσί *we must remember that you are young*. In καὶ μήν it emphasises the fact introduced by καί: II. 19. 45 καὶ μὴν οἱ τότε γ' εἰς ἀγορὴν ἴσαν *observe that even these then went*.

345.] μέν is very common in Homer. The original simply affirmative force appears especially in the combinations ἦ μέν, καὶ μέν, and the like, in which it is indistinguishable in sense from μήν.*

ἦ μέν is regularly used in *oaths*, and is even found with an Inf. in *oratio obliqua*, as II. 1. 76 καὶ μοι ὅμοσον ἦ μέν μοι . . ἀρήξειν. So in a strong asseveration, as II. 7. 97 ἦ μέν δὴ λῶβη τάδε γ' ἔσσεται *this will really be a foul shame*, Od. 19. 235 ἦ μέν πολλαὶ γ' αὐτὸν ἐθήησαντο *you may be sure that many women gazed with wonder at it*. In these and similar passages μέν

* On the uses of μέν see the dissertation of Carl Mitzbauer, *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel MEN*, Köln, 1884-86.

strengthens a purely affirmative η , and there is no sense of *contrast*. The adversative use may be perceived, as with the simple η (§ 338) and η μήν, when a speaker insists on his assertion as true along with or in spite of other facts: e.g. in Od. 10. 64 πῶς ἦλθες, Ὀδυσσεύ; τίς τοι κακὸς ἔχραε δαίμων; η μὲν σ' ἐνδυκῆως ἀπεπέμπομεν *surely we sent you on your way with due provision*: and in the common form of reproach, Il. 11. 765 ὦ πέπον, η μὲν σοί γε Μενότιος ὦδ' ἐπέτελλε (cp. 5. 197., 9. 252). So with ironical emphasis, Il. 3. 430 η μὲν δὴ πρὶν γ' εὐχε' κτλ. *why surely you boasted &c.*, cp. 9. 348.

The corresponding negative form μὴ μὲν occurs in formal oaths (§ 358, δ), and with the Opt. in a sort of imprecation in Od. 22. 462 μὴ μὲν δὴ καθαρῷ θανάτῳ ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἐλοίμην κτλ. (cp. μὴ μάν). Denial insisted upon in view of some state of things is expressed by οὐ μὲν, as Il. 4. 372 οὐ μὲν Τυδεί γ' ὦδε φίλον πτωσκαζέμεν ἦεν (*why do you shrink?*) *surely Tydeus did not*.

The form καὶ μὲν answers closely to the Attic καὶ μήν, which is used to call attention to a fact, especially as the ground of an argument; as Il. 18. 362 καὶ μὲν δὴ πού τις μέλλει βροτὸς κτλ. *a mortal, remember, will accomplish his will*: (*much more a great goddess*): Il. 1. 269 καὶ μὲν τοῖσιν ἐγὼ μεθομίλειον (*these were the mightiest of men*): *yes, and I was of their fellowship*. Sometimes the fact is first indicated, then dwelt upon in a fresh clause with καὶ μὲν: Il. 9. 497 στρεπτοὶ δέ τε καὶ θεοὶ αὐτοί, . . καὶ μὲν τοὺς θυέεσσι κτλ. *even gods may be moved . . they are indeed turned from their anger by sacrifice &c.*: cp. 24. 488, Od. 7. 325., 14. 85. Similarly when a new point in the narrative is reached: as Il. 6. 194 καὶ μὲν οἱ Λύκιοι τέμενος τάμον *yes and* (besides what the king gave) *the Lycian people made him a τέμενος* (cp. 6. 27., 23. 174., 24. 732).

The adversative sense—*but yet, but surely*—is chiefly found after a negative, μὲν being used either alone or in combination with an adversative Conjunction (ἀλλά, ἀτάρ): as—

Il. 1. 602 δαίνυντ', οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἔϊσης
οὐ μὲν φόρμιγγος *nor yet the rhompinæ*.

2. 703 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' οἱ ἀναρχοὶ ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν.

Od. 15. 405 οὐ τι περιπληθὴς λίην τόσον, ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ μὲν.

Il. 6. 123 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ' ὅπωπα . . ἀτὰρ μὲν νῦν γε κτλ.

Also after a question—

Il. 15. 203 η τι μεταστρέψεις; στρεπταὶ μὲν τε φρένες ἐσθλῶν.

With the Article μὲν is sometimes used to bring in a parenthesis, which may be simply affirmative, or indicate some opposition:—

Il. 1. 234 ναὶ μὰ τόδε σκῆπτρον, τὸ μὲν οὐ ποτε φύλλα² καὶ

ὅζους φύσει (= *by this sceptre, even as it shall never &c.*).

5. 892 μητρός τοι μένος ἔστιν ἀάσχετον, οὐκ ἐπιεικτόν,
 Ἥρης, τὴν μὲν ἐγὼ σπουδῇ δάμνημ' ἐπέεσσι
she is indeed one whom I can hardly tame.

Cp. Il. 10. 440., 15. 40., 16. 141. A less emphatic use (merely to bring out a new point in the story) is not uncommon: as Il. 2. 101 ἔσθη σκῆπτρον ἔχων, τὸ μὲν κτλ.: cp. Il. 18. 84, 131., 23. 328, 808, Od. 9. 320, 321. Further, the interposed statement may have a double reference, a corresponding Clause with δέ or αὐτάρ serving to resume the narrative: as—

- Il. 8. 256 ἀλλὰ πολὺν πρῶτος Τρώων ἔλεν ἄνδρα κορυστήν,
 Φραδμουίδην Ἀγέλαον· ὁ μὲν φύγαδ' ἔτραπεν ἵππους,
 τῷ δὲ μεταστρεφθέντι κτλ. (so *ibid.* 268–271).

Again, the return to the main story after a digression may be marked by a similar form: *e.g.* in Od. 6. 13 (after a parenthetical account of the Phaeacians and Alcinous) τοῦ μὲν ἔβη πρὸς δῶμα κτλ. *now it was to his house that she went*: cp. Od. 9. 325.

ΤΟΙ.

346.] The enclitic τοι seems properly to express a *restricted* affirmation, generally qualifying a preceding statement: *at least, yet surely, &c.* It is especially used of a *concession*, whether made by the speaker or claimed from the person addressed: as Il. 4. 405 ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι: 5. 801 Τυδεὺς τοι μικρὸς μὲν ἔην δέμας, ἀλλὰ μαχητὴς *Tydeus, you must admit, &c.*: 5. 892 μητρός τοι μένος ἔστιν ἀάσχετον *I admit (as an excuse)*: 8. 294 οὐ μὲν τοι ὄση δύναμις γε πάρεστι παύομαι: cp. 5. 873., 6. 211., 10. 250, Od. 2. 280, &c. So again in maxims, Od. 2. 276 παῖροι γάρ τοι παῖδες κτλ. *few children, it must be said, &c.*: Il. 23. 315 μήτι τοι δρυτόμος κτλ. *it is by understanding, after all, that the woodman &c.*: Od. 9. 27 οὐ τοι ἐγῶγε ἥς γαίης δύναμαι κτλ. *I cannot, when all is said, &c.*: Il. 22. 488, Od. 8. 329, &c.

τοι is combined in Homer with Adversative Particles, as αὐτάρ τοι, ἀλλά τοι (Il. 15. 45, Od. 18. 230); and with μὲν (but not closely, as in the later μέντοι *but*). So with the Affirmative ἦ in ἦ τοι (or ἦτοι), which expresses a restricted concession (Il. 1. 140, 211., 5. 724, &c.). But the combinations καίτοι and yet, τοίνυν so then, and the Disjunctive ἤτοι *either, or*, are post-Homeric.

τοι has the first place in the sentence in the compound τοιγάρ, which is used to begin speeches; as Il. 1. 76 τοιγάρ ἐγὼν ἐρέω *so then I will speak*. It is generally used with the First Person, and has a kind of apologetic force (= *I will say, since I must speak*). In Attic it survives in the compounds τοιγάροισι, τοιγαροῦν: and the same meaning is commonly expressed by τοίνυν.

It has sometimes been thought that τοι is originally the same as the Dat. of σύ, meaning 'I tell you' or the like. The orthotone τοιγάρ (or τοι γάρ, as some MSS. read) is difficult to explain on this view. It has also been explained as the Locative of τό: cp. the Dat. τῷ = *in that case, therefore*. Or it may be from the same stem as τις and τε (as Kühner holds, § 507): cp. πού (δὴ πού) = *somehow, thence surely*. But the Loc. of this stem exists already in the form τοῖ *whither*.

ἄρα, γάρ.

347.] The Adverb ἄρα properly means *fittingly, accordingly* (root ἀρ- *to fit*). The forms ἄρ and ῥα seem to be varieties produced by difference of stress, answering to the different values which the Particle may have in the sentence. Of these ἄρ retains its accent, but ῥα, the shortest form, is enclitic.

The ordinary place of ἄρα is at the beginning of a Clause which expresses what is *consequent* upon something already said. But occasionally it follows a Participle in the same Clause, as in the formula ἦ τοι ὃ γ' ὡς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο (cp. Il. 2. 310., 5. 748).

It is to be observed, however, that ἄρα may indicate a *reason* (as well as a consequence): that is to say, we may go back from a fact to the *antecedent* which falls in with and so *explains* it. *E.g.* Il. 1. 429 χωόμενον κατὰ θυμὸν ἐϋζώνιοι γυναικός, τήν ῥα . . ἀπηύρων *whom (and this was the reason of his anger) they had taken away*. So in the combinations ὅς ῥα, ἐπεὶ ῥα, ὅτι ῥα, οὖνεκ' ἄρα = *because (and this is the explanation)*: also in γάρ ῥα, as Il. 1. 113 καὶ γάρ ῥα Κλυταιμνήστρης προβέβουλα.

ἄρα is also found in the first of two correlative Clauses, as—

εἰ τ' ἄρ' ὃ γ' εὐχολῆς ἐπιμέμφεται εἰ θ' ἐκατόμβης.

ὡς ἄγαγ' ὡς μήτ' ἄρ τις ἴδῃ μήτ' ἄρ τε νοήσῃ.

The parallel form of the sentence enables us to regard the first Clause, by anticipation, as falling in with and completing the second.

The Attic ἄρα is unknown to Homer. Whether it is identical with ἄρα seems doubtful. It is worth while noticing that ἄρα answers in usage to the Homeric combination ἦ ῥα (*is it then—?*).

348.] The Causal Particle γάρ is originally a compound of γε and ἄρα, but the two elements have so completely united into a new whole that the fresh combination γάρ ῥα is found in Homer.

γάρ serves to indicate that the Clause in which it is used is a *reason* or *explanation*, usually of something just mentioned or suggested: as τῷ γάρ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρῃ· κήδετο γὰρ Δαναῶν, κτλ. Thus it follows the *sequence of thought*—by which we go back from a consequent to an antecedent—whereas

ἄρα more commonly (though not always) indicates the sequence of the facts themselves.

Compare the double use of δ , $\delta\tau\iota$, $\delta\tau\epsilon$ (1) to express a cause, (2) to express a consequent used as an argument (cp. $\tau\acute{o}\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\delta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\pi\nu\nu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\ \beta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, and other examples in § 269). To understand the ordinary use of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ we have only to suppose that when a speaker was going back upon an antecedent fact, he generally used the combination $\gamma\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ ($\gamma' \acute{\alpha}\rho$, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$), rather than the simple $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$. The principle of this usage is that a causal relation may be indicated by a distinction of emphasis, such as $\gamma\epsilon$ would express (as indeed $\gamma\epsilon$ alone sometimes has a distinctly causal force).

As subordinate or exceptional uses, we have to note the following:—

1. The use of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ to introduce a mere explanation, which became very common in Attic (e.g. Thuc. i. 8 $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \Delta\acute{\eta}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$) and may be traced back to Homer. Thus—

Π. 8. 147 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{o}\delta' \acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \theta\upsilon\mu\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota$
 $\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega\rho\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \phi\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$

This idiom—by which the Clause with $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ becomes a kind of Object-Clause, in apposition to a Pronoun—may be compared with the use of $\delta\tau\iota$ and $\omicron\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\alpha$ with the meaning *that*, instead of *because*: see §§ 268, 269. In both cases the language does not clearly distinguish between the *ground* of a fact (which is properly a separate and prior fact), and a mere *analysis*, or statement of circumstances in which a fact consists.

2. The inversion (as it may be regarded) by which the Clause with $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ precedes the fact explained; as—

Π. 2. 802 $\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\rho\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau' \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \omega\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \gamma\epsilon\ \rho\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\iota$
 $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \delta\sigma\tau\upsilon\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\ \Pi\rho\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\iota,$
 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\ \delta' \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu\ \gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha\ \pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omega\nu$
 $\tau\omicron\iota\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho\ \sigma\eta\mu\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega$ (Π. 13. 736., 23.
 890, Od. i. 337., 9. 319., 10. 174, 190, 226,
 383., 11. 69., 12. 154, 208, 320, &c.).

Here the speaker begins by stating something that leads up to his main point. Sometimes, especially when the reason is stated at some length, the main point is marked as an inference by $\tau\acute{\omega}$ so, *therefore*: as—

Π. 7. 328 $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \tau\epsilon\theta\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\ \kappa\omicron\mu\acute{o}\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\chi\alpha\iota\omicron\iota,$
 $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \nu\upsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha\ \kappa\epsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\acute{o}\nu\ .\ .$

331 $\tau\acute{\omega}\ \sigma\epsilon\ \chi\rho\acute{\eta}\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\mu' \eta\omicron\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\sigma\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\chi\alpha\iota\omega\nu.$

So Π. 13. 228., 15. 739., 17. 221, 338., 23. 607; there is no instance in the Odyssey.

When the Clause with $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ precedes, it may be opposed to the preceding context: hence the $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ may be combined with adversative Conjunctions, as—

Π. 12. 326 $\nu\upsilon\nu\ \delta' \acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \kappa\acute{\eta}\rho\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu\ \theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\ .\ .$
 $\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$ (cp. Π. 7. 73., 17. 338., 24. 223).

Od. 14. 355 ἄλλ' οὐ γάρ σφιν ἐφαίνετο κέρδιον εἶναι
μαίεσθαι προτέρω· τοὶ μὲν πάλιν αὖτις ἔβαινον
νῆος ἐπὶ γλαφυρῆς (cp. Od. 19. 591).

ἀλλὰ—γάρ also occurs without a subsequent Clause:—

Od. 10. 201 κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως, θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντες·
ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξις ἐγίγνετο μυρομένοισι.

Here it has the force of 'but be that as it may,' 'but the truth is' (Riddell, *Dig.* § 147). That is, ἀλλὰ—γάρ meets what has preceded not by a simple opposition, but by one which consists in going back to a *reason* for the opposite: which may be enough to convey the speaker's meaning.

In these uses of γάρ the peculiarity is more logical than grammatical. The γάρ (or rather the ἄρα contained in it) indicates that the Clause gives a *reason* or *explanation*, which the speaker chooses to mention before the consequent or thing to be explained. The use only strikes us because the English *for* is restricted to causal clauses placed in the more natural order.

With δὲ—γάρ and ἀλλὰ—γάρ it is incorrect (as Riddell shows, *l.c.*) to treat the Clause with γάρ as a parenthesis (writing *e.g.* νῦν δ'—ἔμπης γὰρ κτλ.). The Clause so introduced is always in opposition to the preceding context, so that the δέ or ἀλλά has its full force.

3. After the Relative ὅς, ἣ, ὅ: as—

Il. 12. 344 ἀμφοτέρω μὲν μάλλον· ὃ γάρ κ' ὄχ' ἄριστον ἀπάντων
εἶη (so Il. 23. 9, Od. 24. 190).

Od. 1. 286 (Μενέλαος) ὃς γὰρ δεύτατος ἦλθεν (cp. 17. 172).

So with ὥς γάρ=*for thus*, and ἵνα γάρ (Il. 10. 127).

These are generally regarded as instances of the original use of ὅς as a Demonstrative (§ 265). But it is only the use of γάρ that is peculiar; or rather, this is only another case in which γάρ is not translated by *for*. It will be seen that ὃς γάρ may always be replaced by ὃς ἄρα without changing the sense.

4. In abrupt *questions*, and expressions of *surprise*: as—

Il. 1. 123 πῶς γάρ τοι δώσουσι γέρας μεγάθυμοι Ἀχαιοί;
why, how are the Greeks to give you a prize?

18. 182 Ἴρι θεά, τίς γάρ σε θεῶν ἔμοι ἄγγελον ἦκε;

1. 293 ἦ γάρ κεν δειλός τε καὶ οὐτιδανὸς καλεοίμην κτλ.
why, I should be a coward &c.

So in the formulae of *wish*, εἰ γάρ, αἶ γάρ, &c. In all such cases the γάρ seems to be mainly interjectional. Properly it implies that the speaker is taking up the thread of a previous speech, and as it were continuing the construction; the new Clause being one that gives a reason, or affects to do so ironically. Particles so used easily acquire an irrational character. We may compare

the use of δέ and τ' ἄρα in questions, ὥς in expressions of *wish*, ἀλλά before an imperative (§ 336): also the English use of *why*, *well*, and similar pleonasm.

οὖν, δή, νυ, θην.

349.] οὖν in Homer does not properly express *inference*, or even *consequence* (like ἄρα). Its use is to affirm something with reference to other facts, already mentioned or known; hence it may generally be represented by a phrase such as *after all*, *be this as it may*, &c. *E.g.*—

Il. 2. 350 φημι γὰρ οὖν *for I do declare that &c.*

Od. 11. 350 ξείνος δὲ τλήτω, μάλα περ νόστοιο χαρίζων,
ἐμπης οὖν ἐπιμείναι ἐς αὔριον (*nevertheless to wait*).

Like ἄρα, it is used to emphasise correlative Clauses, but only with the negative οὔτε—οὔτε and μήτε—μήτε: as—

Od. 6. 192 οὐτ' οὖν ἐσθήτος δηνήσσαι οὔτε τευ ἄλλου.

Il. 16. 97 αἰ γὰρ... μήτε τις οὖν Τρώων... μήτε τις Ἀργείων, κτλ.
(so Il. 8. 7., 17. 20., 20. 7, Od. 1. 414., 2. 200.,
11. 200., 16. 302., 17. 401).

The combination γ' οὖν (not to be written γοὖν in Homer) occurs only twice, with the meaning *in any case*:—

Il. 5. 258 εἰ γ' οὖν ἕτερός γε φύγησι *if one of the two does (after all) escape*.

16. 30 μὴ ἐμέ γ' οὖν οὗτός γε λάβοι χόλος
(cp. 19. 94 κατὰ δ' οὖν ἕτερόν γε πέδησεν).

As an emphatic Particle of *transition* οὖν is found in μὲν οὖν (Il. 9. 550, and several times in the Odyssey), much more frequently in the combinations ἐπεὶ οὖν, ὥς οὖν. In these an approach to the *illative* force may perhaps be observed.

350.] δή is properly a *temporal* Particle, meaning *now*, at *length* (Lat. *jam*): hence it implies arriving at a result, as ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην *from the time that the point was reached when they quarrelled*: εἰ δὴ *if it has come to this that*, and so *if finally, if really*. With Superlatives it expresses that the highest stage has been reached, as Il. 1. 266 κάρτιστοι δὴ κείνοι κτλ. *these were quite (finally) the mightiest*. So in questions, πῶς δὴ *how has it come to be that*—; and prohibitions, μὴ δὴ *do not go so far as to*—.

δὴ may begin a sentence in Homer, as Il. 15. 437 Τεῦκερ πέπον, δὴ ρῶϊν ἀπέκτατο πιστὸς ἑταῖρος: and often in the combinations δὴ τότε (*tum vero*), and δὴ γάρ. The original meaning is best seen in these forms (where δὴ is emphatic), and in ἤδη (for ἡ δὴ), and ἐπεὶ δὴ.

As δὴ is one of the words which unite with a following vowel,

so as to form one syllable, it is sometimes written δ', and so is liable to be confused with δέ. This occurs especially in the combinations δὴ αὖ, δὴ αὐτός, δὴ οὕτως: as Il. 1. 131 μὴ δὴ οὕτως, 340 εἴ ποτε δὴ αὐτε, 10. 385 πῇ δὴ οὕτως, 20. 220 δς δὴ ἀφνειότατος κτλ. So in εἰ δ' ἄγε the sense generally requires δὴ: see § 321.

Note that δῆτα, δῆθεν (cognate or derivative forms) are post-Homeric; as also are the combinations δήπου, καὶ δή.

351.] νυ is obviously a shortened form of νῦν *now*. It is used as an affirmative Particle (like δή, but somewhat less emphatic), especially in combinations such as ἦ ῥά νυ, καὶ νύ κε, οὐ νυ, μή νυ, ἐπεὶ νυ, and after Interrogatives, as τίς νυ *who now*, τί νυ *why now* (see Od. 1. 59-62).

The form νυ is exclusively Epic: νυν (ῥ), which is used by Attic poets (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* ii. p. 183) appears in Il. 10. 105 ὅσα πού νυν ἐέλπεται, and Il. 23. 485 δεῦρό νυν, ἢ τρίποδος κτλ.: but it is probably not Homeric.

In Il. 10. 105 the sense is distinctly temporal, and accordingly we should probably read νῦν ἐλπεται. The temporal sense also suits Il. 23. 485, where moreover there is a variant δεῦρό γε νῦν τρίποδος, found in the Scholia on Aristophanes (Ach. 771, Eq. 788).

352.] θην is an affirmative enclitic, giving a mocking or ironical force, like the later δήπου and δῆθεν (which is perhaps originally δὴ θην): as Il. 2. 276 οὐ θήν μιν πάλιν αὖτις ἀνήσει θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ *his bold spirit will not I imagine impel him again*: Il. 13. 620 λείψετε θην οὕτω γε *methinks in this fashion you will leave &c.* It is only Epic.

περ.

353.] The enclitic Particle περ is evidently a shorter form of the Preposition περί, which in its adverbial use has the meaning *beyond, exceedingly* (§ 185). Accordingly περ is *intensive*, denoting that the word to which it is subjoined is true in a high degree, in its fullest sense, &c.: *e.g.*—

Il. 23. 79 λάχε γεινόμενόν περ *was my fate even from my birth*.

Od. 1. 315 μή μ' ἔτι νῦν κατέρυκε λυλαιόμενόν περ ὁδοῖο.

8. 187 στιβαρώτερον οὐκ ὀλίγον περ.

Il. 2. 236 οἰκαδέ περ σὺν νηυσὶ νεώμεθα
(= *let us have nothing short of return home*).

8. 452 σφῶν δὲ πρὶν περ τρόμος ἔλλαβε φάδιμα γυῖα
even beforehand trembling seized your knees.

13. 72 ἀρίγνωτοι δὲ θεοὶ περ *gods, surely, are easily known*.

Od. 4. 34 αἱ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς | ἐξοπίσω περ παύσῃ διζύος.

So with Relatives, *ὅς περ the very one who*, *ὥς ἔσεται περ* (Attic *ὥσπερ καὶ ἔσται*) *just as it will be*, *ὅτε περ just when*. Also *εἰ περ even if*, and *ἢ περ* or *ἤ περ even than*.

Usually, however, *περ* implies a sense of opposition; *i.e.* it emphasises something as true *in spite of* a preceding assertion: as *οὐ τι δυνήσεται ἀγνύμενός περ thou wilt not be able, however much vexed*, *πολλές περ ἔόντες many as they are*, *πίνοντά περ ἔμπης even though drinking*, &c.; and with Substantives, *Il. 20. 65 τὰ τε στυγέουσι θεοὶ περ which even the gods* (gods though they are) *dread*. So *Il. 1. 353 ἐπεὶ μ' ἔτεκές γε, μινυνθάδιόν περ ἔοντα since you are my mother, short-lived though I am*. Or it may imply compensation for the *absence* of something else: *Il. 1. 508 ἀλλὰ σύ πέρ μιν τίσῃς do thou honour him* (since Agamemnon will not); *17. 121 αἶ κε νέκυν περ Ἀχιλλῆϊ προφέρωμεν γυννόν ἅτὰρ τὰ γε τεύχε' κτλ.*

The intensive *καί* and *περ* are often used with the same word or phrase: as *καὶ ὀψέ περ even though late*, *καὶ πρὸς δαίμονά περ even though it were against a higher power*, *καὶ πεζὸς περ ἑὼν though only on foot*: *εἰ δὲ καὶ Ἑκτορά περ φιλέεις*, &c. So with *οὐδέ not even*, as *οὐδὲ θεοὶ περ not even the gods*, *οὐδ' ὥς περ not even so*, *οὐδὲ νῦ σοὶ περ not even to you*.

The combination *καί περ* (or *καίπερ*) occurs in Homer in one place only, viz. *Od. 7. 224 καὶ περ πολλὰ παθόντα*.

When *καί* precedes a word followed by *περ*, it is always = *even* (not *and*). Hence in *Il. 5. 135 καὶ πρὶν περ μεμαῶς* means *even though formerly eager*, and is to be taken with the preceding line, not with the succeeding *δὴ τότε μιν κτλ.* Thus there is no *anacoluthon*, as is generally assumed.

ΓΕ.

354.] *γε* is used, like *περ*, to emphasise a particular word or phrase. It does not however *intensify* the meaning, or insist on the fact as *true*, but only calls attention to the word or fact, distinguishing it from others: *e.g.*—

Il. 1. 81 εἰ περ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ καταπέψῃ,
ἀλλὰ τε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχει κότον.

Here *γε* shows that the word *χόλος* is chosen in order to be contrasted with *κότος*. So too—

Il. 2. 379 εἰ δέ ποτ' ἔς γε μίαν βουλευόμεν, οὐκέρ' ἔπειτα κτλ.
(if we could ever agree, instead of contending).

Again, where an idea is repeated—

Il. 5. 350 εἰ δὲ σύ γ' ἔς πόλεμον πωλήσῃαι, ἢ τέ σ' ὅτω
ρίγῃσιν πόλεμόν γε.

Cp. also *Il. 1. 299 ἐπεὶ μ' ἀφέλεσθέ γε δόντες since you have but*

taken away what you gave (where we should rather emphasise *δόντες*): Od. 4. 193 οὐ τοι ἔγωγε τέρπομαι δδυρόμενος . . νεμεσσωμαι γε μὲν οὐδὲν κλαίειν κτλ. *I do not take pleasure in lamenting, but yet I do not say that I complain of a man weeping &c.*: 9. 393 τὸ γὰρ αὐτε σιδήρου γε κράτος ἐστὶ *that is the strength of iron* (*in particular*): 10. 93 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ' ἀέξετο κῦμά γ' ἐν αὐτῷ, οὔτε μέγ' οὔτ' ὀλίγον, λευκὴ δ' ἦν ἀμφὶ γαλήνῃ *no wave at all* (nothing that could be called a wave) *rose in it, &c.*

So too γε emphasises a word as a strong or appropriate one, or as chosen under the influence of feeling (anger, contempt, &c.). As examples may be quoted, Od. 9. 458 τῷ κέ οἱ ἐγκέφαλός γε . . ῥαίσιτο κτλ.: 17. 244 τῷ κέ τοι ἀγλαίας γε διασκεδάσειεν ἀπάσας: Il. 7. 198 ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ νῆϊδά γ' οὕτως ἔλπομαι κτλ. So in the phrase εἰ ποτ' ἔην γε, which means *if he lived at all*, and thus is a form of asseveration; e.g. Il. 3. 180 θαῖρ αὐτ' ἐμὸς ἔσκε κυνώπιδος εἰ ποτ' ἔην γε *he was my brother-in-law if he was anything, i. e. that he was so is as sure as that there was such a person.*

γε is common with the Article (§ 257, 2) and the Personal Pronouns (so that it is usual to write ὄγε, ἔγωγε as one word), also with ὅδε, οὗτος, κείνος, and the corresponding Adverbs ὧδε, τότε, &c. It serves chiefly to bring out the contrast which these Pronouns more or less distinctly imply. Similarly with words implying comparison, as ἄλλος and ἕτερος, πρὶν, πάρος, &c. When a special emphasis is intended, Homer usually employs περ, as Od. 1. 59 οὐδέ νυ σοὶ περ ἐντρέπεται φίλον ἦτορ *not even are you moved* (who are especially bound to care for Ulysses). So too, as Nauck has pointed out (*Mél. gr.-rom.* iv. 501), πάρος γε means *before* (*not now*), while πάρος περ means *even before* (*not merely now*). Hence in Il. 13. 465 ὃς σε πάρος γε γαμβρὸς ἐὼν ἔθρεψε the γε of the MSS. is right; and so we should read (with A against other MSS.) Il. 17. 587 ὃς τὸ πάρος γε μαλθακὸς αἰχμητής, but (again with A) in Il. 15. 256 ὃς σε πάρος περ ῥύομαι.

In a Conditional Protasis (with ὅς, ὅτε, εἰ, &c.), γε emphasises the condition as such: hence εἰ γε *if only, always supposing that*; cp. Od. 2. 31 ἦν χ' ὑμῖν σάφα εἴποι, ὅτε πρότερός γε πύθοιτο *which he would tell you, if and when he had been first to hear it*. On the other hand, εἰ περ means *supposing ever so much, hence if really* (Lat. *si quidem*). So when πρὶν expresses a condition (§ 297) it takes γε, as Il. 5. 288 πρὶν γ' ἢ ἑτερόν γε πεσόντα κτλ.

οὐ, μή.

355.] οὐκί, οὐκ, οὐ. The full form οὐκί occurs in the formula ἡὲ καὶ οὐκί *or else not* (Il. 2. 238, &c.), and one or two similar phrases: Il. 15. 137 ὃς τ' αἰτίος ὃς τε καὶ οὐκί, and Il. 20. 255 πᾶλλ' ἑτεὰ τε καὶ οὐκί.

The general use of οὐ is to *deny* the predication to which it is attached (while μή *forbids* or *deprecates*). In some instances, however, οὐ does not merely negative the Verb, but expresses the *opposite* meaning: οὐ φημι is not *I do not say*, but *I deny, refuse*; οὐκ ἐῶ *I forbid*, &c. (Krüger, § 67, 1, 1).

The uses of οὐ in Subordinate Clauses, and with the Infinitive and Participle, will be best treated along with the corresponding uses of μή (§§ 359, 360).

According to Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* iv. p. 147) the negative Particle was treated originally like the Prepositions, *i.e.* it was placed immediately before the Verb, and closely connected with it: as in the Latin *ne-scio, ne-queo, nolo*, and in some parallel Slavonic forms. The same relation appears in the accent of οὐ φημι, and in the use of οὐ in the combinations οὐκ ἐθέλω, οὐκ ἔδω, &c., in which οὐ is retained where general rules would require μή (§ 359).

356.] οὐδέ, μηδέ. These forms are generally used as negative connecting Particles (*but not, and not*). Sometimes however they have a strengthening or emphatic force, corresponding to the similar use of καί in affirmative sentences; as Il. 5. 485 τύνη δ' ἔστηκας, ἀτὰρ οὐδ' ἄλλοισι κελεύεις *you stand still (yourself)*, and (*what is more*) *do not call on the others to fight*: and in combination with περ, as Il. 4. 387 ἐνθ' οὐδὲ ξείνός περ ἐὼν κτλ. *So καὶ ὅς even he, οὐδ' ὅς not even he*, &c.

οὐδέις is originally an emphatic form (like the later οὐδὲ εἰς). In Homer the Neut. οὐδέν is occasionally found, sometimes as an emphatic Adverb, = *not at all*, as Il. 1. 244 ὃ τ' ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισας (so Il. 1. 412., 16. 274., 22. 332, 513., 24. 370, Od. 4. 195., 9. 287): sometimes as a Substantive, *nothing at all* (Nom. and Acc.), as Od. 9. 34 ὥς οὐδὲν γλύκιον *no single thing is sweeter* (cp. 18. 130., 22. 318). The adjectival use is found with ἔπος (Od. 4. 350., 17. 141), also in Il. 10. 216 τῇ μὲν κτέρας οὐδὲν ὁμοῖον, and perhaps Il. 22. 513 οὐδὲν σοί γ' ὄφελος (where οὐδέν may be adverbial). The Gen. Neut. appears in the Compound οὐδενός-ωρος *worth nothing* (Il. 8. 178). The Masc. occurs only in the phrase τὸ δὲ μένος οὐδενὶ εἴκων (Il. 22. 459, Od. 11. 515).

The form μηδέις is post-Homeric, except the form μηδέν, which occurs only in Il. 18. 500 ὃ δ' ἀναλνέτο μηδὲν ἐλέσθαι.

357.] Double negation. This characteristic feature of Greek is caused by the tendency to *repeat* the negative Particle with any word or phrase to which the negation especially applies: as Il. 1. 114 ἐπεὶ οὐ ἐθέν ἐστι χερσίων, οὐ δέμας κτλ. *since she is not inferior—not in form &c.* The emphatic οὐδέ and μηδέ are chiefly used in this way: as οὐ μὰν οὐδ' Ἀχιλεὺς κτλ. *no, not even Achilles* &c.: Il. 2. 703 οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' οἱ ἀναρχοὶ ἔσαν: Od. 8. 280 τὰ γ'

οὐ κέ τις οὐδὲ ἴδοιτο, οὐδὲ θεῶν μακάρων: Π. 6. 58 μηδ' ὄν τινα γαστέρι μήτηρ κοῦρον ζόντα φέροι μηδ' ὅς φύγοι.

358.] μή is commonly used (as we should expect) with the Moods expressive of *command* or *wish*, viz. the Imperative, the Subjunctive and the Optative. These uses having been discussed (§§ 278, 281, 299, 303, &c.), it only remains to notice some idiomatic uses in which μή is found with the Mood of simple *assertion* or *denial*.

With the **Indicative** μή is used in Homer—

(a) In the phrase μη ὥφελλον (or ὥφελον) *would that I had not &c.* Logically the μή in this idiom belongs to the following Infinitive (cp. § 355).

(b) In *oaths*, to express solemn or impassioned denial:—

Π. 10. 329 ἴστω νῦν Ζεὺς αὐτός, ἐρίγδουπος πόσις Ἕρης,
μη μὲν τοῖς ἵπποισιν ἀνὴρ ἐποχήσεται ἄλλος
(*I swear that no one else shall ride &c.*).

15. 36 ἴστω νῦν τόδε γαῖα . . .

41 μη δὲ ἐμὴν ἰότητα Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων | πημαίνει.

In this use μή denies by *disclaiming* (as it were) or protesting against a fact supposed to be within the speaker's power (= *far be it from me that &c.*). We should probably add—

Π. 19. 258 ἴστω νῦν Ζεὺς πρῶτα κτλ.

μη μὲν ἐγὼ κούρη Βρισηίδι χεῖρ' ἐπένεικα,

where the MSS. have ἐπενείκαι. The Indic. form was restored conjecturally by Stephanus.

(c) After ἦ, to express incredulity, &c.:—

Od. 6. 200 ἦ μή πού τινα δυσμενέων φάσθ' ἔμμεναι ἀνδρῶν
(*surely you do not suppose it is any enemy!*)

9. 405 ἦ μή τίς σευ μῆλα βροτῶν ἀέκοντος ἐλαύνει;
ἦ μή τίς σ' αὐτὸν κτείνει δόλω ἢ βίηφι;
(*surely no one is driving off your sheep? &c.*)

This is the common type of 'question expecting a negative answer,' viz. a strong form of denial uttered in a hesitating or interrogative tone. Compare the quasi-interrogative use of ἦ (§ 338) to indicate surprise or indignation.

(d) After Verbs of *fearing* which relate to a past event:—

Od. 5. 300 δεῖδω μη δὴ πάντα θεὰ νημερτέα εἶπεν.

Here, as with the Subj. (§ 281, 1), the Clause with μή passes into an Object-Clause. The difference is that the Indicative shows the event to be past.

So perhaps Od. 13. 216 μή τί μοι οἴχονται *I fear they are gone*: but the better reading is οἴχωνται, the Subj. being understood as in Il. 1. 555 μή σε παρείπη

lest she have persuaded thee (*i. e.* prove to have persuaded); cp. Od. 21. 395 *μη κέρα ἴνες ἔδοιεν* lest worms should (be found to) have eaten (§ 303, 1). Cp. Matth. xvi. 5 *ἔπελάθοντο ἄρτους λαβεῖν* they found that they had forgotten (Field's *Otium Norvicense*, Pt. 3, p. 7).

The use of the Past Indicative after Verbs of *fearing* is closely parallel to the use in Final Clauses, noticed in § 325. While the Clause, as an expression of the speaker's mind about an event—his fear or his purpose—should have a Subj. or Opt., the sense that the happening of the event is matter of past fact causes the Indicative to be preferred. Cp. the Modal uses noticed in §§ 324–326, and the remark in § 323 as to the tendency in favour of the Indicative.

The essence of these idioms is the combination of the imperative *tone*—shown in the use of *μη*—with the Mood proper to a simple assertion. The tendency to resort to the form of *prohibition* in order to express strong or passionate *denial* may be seen in the use of *μη* with the Optative in *deprecating* a supposition (§ 299, *e*), and of *μη* with the Subj. in *oaths*, as Od. 12. 300., 18. 56.

359.] Conditional Clauses. The rule which prescribes *μη* as the negative Particle to be used in every Clause of Conditional meaning does not hold universally. In Homer—

(*a*) When the Verb is a Subjunctive or Optative *μη* is used: the very few exceptions being confined to *οὐκ ἐθέλω* (Il. 3. 289., 15. 492) and *οὐκ ἔάω* (Il. 20. 139), which are treated almost as Compounds (§ 355). Cp. the use of *οὐκ ἐθέλω* in Final Clauses, as Il. 5. 233 *μη . . ματήσεται οὐδ' ἐθέλητον κτλ.*

(*b*) With the Relatives *ὅς*, *ὅσος*, &c. when the Verb is an Indicative *οὐ* is generally used; as—

Il. 2. 143 *πᾶσι μετὰ πληθύν, ὅσοι οὐ βουλῆς ἐπάκουσαν.*

Od. 3. 348 *ὥς τέ τευ ἦ παρὰ πάμπαν ἀνέιμονος ἢ πενιχροῦ, ᾧ οὐ τι χλαῖναι κτλ.* (a general description).

Il. 2. 338 *νηπιᾶχοις, οἷς οὐ τι μέλει κτλ.* (so 7. 236., 18. 363). The only clear instance of *μη* is Il. 2. 301 *ἐστὲ δὲ πάντες μάρτυροι, οὓς μη κῆρες ἔβαν θανάτοιο φέρουσαι*, where the speaker wishes to make an *exception* to what he has just said. In Od. 5. 489 *ᾧ μη πάρα γέλτονες ἄλλοι* we may supply either *εἰσί* or *ἔωσι*: the latter is found in the similar cases Od. 4. 164., 23. 118. But Hesiod uses *μη* with the Indic.; see Theog. 387, Op. 225.

(*c*) With *εἰ* and the Indicative *οὐ* is used when the Clause with *εἰ* precedes the Principal Clause: as—

Il. 4. 160 *εἰ περ γάρ τε καὶ αὐτίκ' Ὀλύμπιος οὐκ ἐτέλεσσε*, and similarly in Il. 9. 435., 15. 213, Od. 19. 85, and the (eight) other places quoted in § 316. But when the Clause with *εἰ* follows the other, *μη* is used, as in the sentences of the form—

Il. 2. 155 *ἔνθα κεν . . νόστος ἐτόχθη | εἰ μη κτλ.*

The only instance in which this rule fails seems to be—

Od. 9. 410 εἰ μὲν δὴ μή τις σε βιάζεται οἶον ἔδντα,
νοῦσόν γ' οὐ πως ἔστι Διὸς μεγάλου ἀλέασθαι.

Here μή τις may be used rather than οὐ τις in order to bring out more clearly the misunderstanding of the οὐτις of Polyphemus.

This curious law was pointed out by A. R. Vierke, in a valuable dissertation *De μὴ particulae cum indicativo conjunctae usu antiquiore* (Lipsiae, 1876). With regard to the ground of it, we may observe that a Clause with εἰ in most cases precedes the apodosis; and this is probably the original order. When it is inverted it may be that the use of μή instead of οὐ has a prohibitive character, as though the condition were added as an afterthought, *in bar* of what has been already said. In any case the inversion throws an *emphasis* on the Clause, which would account for the preference for μή; see § 358.

360.] Infinitive and Participle. It appears from comparison with the forms of negation in the oldest Sanscrit that the negative Particles were originally used only with *finite Verbs*. The negation of a Noun was expressed by forming it into a Compound with the prefix *an-* or *a-* (Greek ἀν-, ἀ-): and the Infinitives and Participles were treated in this respect as Nouns. The first exception to this rule in Greek was probably the use of οὐ with the Participle—a use which is well established in Homer.

οὐ with the Infinitive is used in Homer (as in Attic) after Verbs of *saying, thinking, knowing, &c.* (§ 237); as in Il. 16. 61 ἦ τοι ἔφην γε οὐ πρὶν μνηϊθμόν καταπαυσέμεν κτλ.: Od. 5. 342 δοκέεις δέ μοι οὐκ ἀπνύσσειν.

This use however is to be compared with that noticed above (§ 355), in which an οὐ which belongs in sense to the Infinitive is placed before the governing Verb; as οὐ φησιν δώσειν *he says he will not give*. Sometimes the Homeric language seems to hesitate between the two forms, or to use them indifferently: compare (*e.g.*) Il. 12. 106 οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔφαντο σχήσεσθ' κτλ. and (a few lines further) l. 125 ἔφαντο γὰρ οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοὺς σχήσεσθ' κτλ. Occasionally the negative is used with the Verb and repeated with the Infinitive:—

Il. 17. 641 ἐπεὶ οὐ μιν ὀλομαι οὐδὲ πεπύσθαι (cp. 12. 73).

Od. 3. 27 οὐ γὰρ δῶα | οὐ σε θεῶν ἀέκητι γενέσθαι κτλ.

It may be conjectured that the use of οὐ with the governing Verb is the more ancient; the use with the Infinitive is obviously the more logical.

361.] μὴ with the Infinitive and Participle. The Homeric uses of this kind are few and simple in comparison with those of later Greek.

The Infinitive when used for the Imperative (§ 241) naturally takes μὴ instead of οὐ: as Il. 4. 42 μὴ τι διατρίβειν τὸν ἔμδον χόλον, ἀλλὰ μ' ἔασαι.

An Infinitive which stands as Object of a Verb of *saying, &c.* takes μὴ when it expresses *command* or *wish*: as Il. 3. 434 παύεσθαι κέλομαι μῆδὲ κτλ. *I bid you stop and not &c.* (so 9. 12): Od.

I. 37 ἐπεὶ πρό οἱ εἶπομεν ἡμεῖς μήτ' κτλ. *we told him before not to &c.* So Od. 9. 530 δὸς μὴ Ὀδυσσῆα . . ἰκέσθαι *grant that Ulysses may not come.*

Again, a dependent Infinitive takes μή in *oaths*, as Il. 19. 176 ὀμνύτω . . μὴ ποτε τῆς εὐνῆς ἐπιβήμεναι κτλ. *let him swear that he never &c.*; cp. Od. 5. 184 ἴστω νῦν τόδε γαῖα . . μὴ τί σοι αὐτῷ πῆμα κακὸν βουλευσέμεν ἄλλο, and Il. 19. 258 (but see § 358 b). So generally after Verbs of *promising*, &c. as Il. 14. 45 ὥς ποτ' ἐπηπείλησεν . . μὴ πρὶν κτλ. *threatened that he would not &c.*; Il. 18. 500 ὁ δ' ἀναίνετο μηδὲν ἐλέσθαι *refused to accept anything* (see Mr. Leaf's note *a. l.*). This use of μή is evidently parallel to the use with the Indicative, § 358. Compare also Il. 19. 22 οἷ' ἐπιεικὲς ἔργ' ἔμην ἀθανάτων μηδὲ βροτῶν ἄνδρα τελέσσαι, where the μή may be emphatic (*such as we must not suppose any mortal to have made*)*. Or this may be an instance of the use of μή in Relative Clauses containing a *general description* (§ 359, b).

The use of μή with the Participle appears in one Homeric instance:—

Od. 4. 684 μὴ μνηστεύσαντες μηδ' ἄλλοθ' ὀμιλήσαντες
ῥοσάτα καὶ πύματα νῦν ἐνθάδε δειπνήσειαν.

Here μή belongs to ὀμιλήσαντες, and expresses a *wish*: 'may they (after their wooing) have no other meeting, but sup now for the last time.' For the parenthetical μνηστεύσαντες and the repetition of the negative with ἄλλοτε, cp. the parallel place Od. 11. 613 μὴ τεχνησάμενος μηδ' ἄλλο τι τεχνήσαιο.

KEN and ἄν.

362.] The Particles κεν and ἄν, as we have seen, are used to mark a predication as *conditional*, or made with reference to a particular or *limited* state of things: whereas τε shows that the meaning is *general*. Hence with the Subj. and Opt. κεν or ἄν indicates that an event holds a *definite* place in the expected course of things: in other words, κεν or ἄν points to an *actual occurrence* in the future.†

ΚΕΝ is commoner in Homer than ἄν. In the existing text ΚΕΝ occurs about 630 times in the Iliad, and 520 times in the Odyssey: while ἄν (including ἦν and ἐπὶν) occurs 192 times in

* This would be akin to the later use with Verbs of *belief*. As to the Verbs which take μή see Prof. Gildersleeve in the *Am. Jour. Phil.* vol. i. p. 49.

† 'Im Allgemeinen steht das Resultat durchaus fest: κεν beim Conjunctiv und Optativ weist auf das Eintreten der Handlung hin' (Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.* i. p. 86). This view is contrary to the teaching of most grammarians (see especially Hermann on Soph. O. C. 1446). It will be found stated very clearly in an article in the *Philological Museum*, vol. i. p. 96 (Cambridge 1832).

the Iliad and 157 times in the Odyssey. Thus the proportion is more than 3:1, and is not materially different in the two poems.

It is part of Fick's well known theory that *ἄν* was unknown in the original Homeric dialect (see Appendix F): and a systematic attempt to restore the exclusive use of *κεν* in Homer has been made by a Dutch scholar, J. van Leeuwen,* who has proposed more or less satisfactory emendations of all the places in which *ἄν* now appears. It is impossible to deny the soundness of the principles on which he bases his enquiry. When the poems were chiefly known through oral recitation there must have been a constant tendency to modernise the language. With Attic and Ionic reciters that tendency must have led to *ἄν* creeping into the text, sometimes in place of *κεν*, sometimes where the pure Subj. or Opt. was required by Homeric usage. Evidence of this kind of corruption has been preserved, as Van Leeuwen points out, in the *variae lectiones* of the ancient critics. Thus in Il. 1. 168 *ἐπεὶ κε κάμω* is now read on the authority of Aristarchus; but *ἐπὶν κεκάμω* and *ἐπὶν κε κάμω* were also ancient readings, and *ἐπὶν* is found in all our MSS. Similarly in Il. 7. 5 Aristarchus read *ἐπεὶ κε κάμωσιν*, and the MSS. are divided between *ἐπεὶ κε* and *ἐπὶν κε* (or *ἐπὶν κεκ.*). There is a similar variation between the forms *ἦν* and *εἰ κε* (or *αἶ κε*) in the phrases *αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα*, *αἶ κ' ἐθέλησι*, &c. Thus in Il. 4. 353 (=9. 359) the MSS. nearly all have—

ὄψεαι ἦν ἐθέλησθα καὶ αἶ κέν τοι τὰ μεμήλη,

but *αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα*, which gives a better rhetorical effect, is found in Il. 8. 471 *ὄψεαι αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα* (so all MSS., *ἦν ἐθ.* as a *v. l.* in A), also in Il. 13. 260., 18. 457, Od. 3. 92, &c. Similarly in Il. 16. 453 *ἐπεὶ δὴ τὸν γε λίπη* the *v. l.* *ἐπὶν* is given by good MSS. (D, G, L, and as a variant in A). And the line Il. 11. 797 *Μυρμιδόνων, αἶ κέν τι φόως Δαναοῖσι γένηαι* is repeated in Il. 16. 39 with the variation *ἦν που* for *αἶ κεν*. In such cases we can see the intrusion of *ἄν* actually in process.

Again, the omission of *ἄν* may be required by the metre, or by the *indefinite* character of the sentence (§ 283): *e. g.* in Il. 15. 209 *ὁππότ' ἄν ἰσόμορον ἐθέλησι* both these reasons point to *ὁππότε Φισόμορον κτλ.* So in Il. 2. 228 *εὐτ' ἄν πολίεθρον ἔλωμεν* read *εὐτε πτ.*, and in Od. 11. 17 *οὐθ' ὁπότ' ἄν στείχησι* read *οὐθ' ὁπότε* (*ὅτε κε*, which Van Leeuwen proposes in these two places, is not admissible, since the reference is general).

Several reasons combine to make it probable that the forms *ἦν*

* *De particularum κέν et ἄν apud Homerum usu* (*Mnemosyne*, xv. p. 75). The statistics given above are taken from this valuable dissertation.

and ἐπὶν are post-Homeric. The contraction of εἰ ἄν, ἐπεὶ ἄν is contrary to Homeric analogies (§ 378*), and could hardly have taken place until ἄν became much commoner than it is in Homer. Again, the usage with regard to the order of the Particles excludes the combinations ἦν δέ, ἦν περ, ἦν γάρ—for which Homer would have εἰ δ' ἄν, εἰ περ ἄν, εἰ γὰρ ἄν (§ 365). Again, ἦν cannot properly be used in a *general* statement or simile, and whenever it is so used the metre allows it to be changed into εἰ: *e.g.* in *Il.* 1. 166 ἀτὰρ ἦν ποτε δασμὸς ἱκνται: *Od.* 5. 120 ἦν τίς τε φίλην ποιήσεται ἀκοίτην (ἦ τίς τε in several MSS.): *Od.* 11. 159 ἦν μή τις ἔχῃ εὐεργέα νῆα: *Od.* 12. 288 ἦν πως ἐξαπίνης ἔλθῃ: *Il.* 20. 172 ἦν τινα πέφυγῃ (in a simile). Similar arguments apply with even greater force to ἐπὶν. Of the 48 instances there are 18 in general sentences, and several others (*Il.* 4. 239., 16. 95, *Od.* 3. 45., 4. 412., 5. 348., 11. 119., 15. 36., 21. 159) in which the reference to the future is so indefinite that ἐπεὶ with a pure Subj. is admissible. It cannot be accidental that in these places, with one exception (*Od.* 11. 192), ἐπὶν is followed by a consonant, so that ἐπεὶ can be restored without any metrical difficulty. On the other hand, in 13 places in which ἐπὶν is followed by a vowel the reference is to a definite future event, and accordingly we may read ἐπεὶ κ'. In the combination ἐπὶν δὴ, which occurs seven times, we should probably read ἐπεὶ δὴ, or in some places ἐπεὶ κεν (as in *Od.* 11. 221). The form ἐπειδάν occurs once, in a simile (*Il.* 13. 285): hence we should read ἐπεὶ δὴ (not ἐπεὶ κεν, as Bekker and Nauck, or αἶ κεν as Menrad).

The distinction between general statements and those which refer to an actual future occurrence has hardly been sufficiently attended to in the conjectures proposed by Van Leeuwen and others. Thus in *Od.* 5. 121 ἦν τίς τε φίλον ποιήσεται ἀκοίτην (in a general reflexion) Van Leeuwen would read αἶ κέν τίς τε: and in *Od.* 12. 288 ἦν πως ἐξαπίνης ἔλθῃ he proposes αἶ κέ που. So in *Il.* 6. 489, *Od.* 8. 553 ἐπὶν τὰ πρῶτα γένηται (of the lot of man) he bids us read ἐπεὶ κε. If any change is wanted beyond putting ἐπεὶ for ἐπὶν, the most probable would be ἐπεὶ τε: see § 332. On the other hand he would put ἐπεὶ for ἐπὶν in such places as *Od.* 1. 293 αὐτὰρ ἐπὶν δὴ ταῦτα τελευτήσῃς τε καὶ ἔρῃς (cp. *Od.* 5. 363., 18. 269), where a definite future occasion is implied, and consequently ἐπεὶ κεν (which he reads in *Od.* 4. 414) would be more Homeric. In *Od.* 6. 262 αὐτὰρ ἐπὶν πόλιος ἐπιβήομεν we should perhaps read ἐπεὶ κε πόλεος (υ—): see § 94, 2.

In a few places the true reading may be εἰ or ἐπεὶ with the Opt.: as *Od.* 8. 511 αἶσα γὰρ ἦν ἀπολέσθαι, ἐπὶν πόλις ἀμφικαλύψῃ (ἐπεὶ . . ἀμφικαλύψαι, as in *Il.* 19. 208 we should read ἐπεὶ τισαίμεθα): *Od.* 21. 237 (= 383) ἦν δέ τις . . ἀκούσῃ μή τι ὑβράζε προβάλλωσκειν (εἰ δέ τις . . ἀκούσαι): *Il.* 15. 504., 17. 245., 22. 55, 487.

The form ὅτ' ἄν occurs in our text in 29 places, and in 22 of these the metre admits ὅτε κ' (χ'), which Van Leeuwen accordingly would restore. The mischief however must lie deeper. Of the 22 places there are 13 in which ὅτ' ἄν appears in the leading clause of a simile (ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἄν—), and in three

others (Il. 2. 397, Od. 11. 18., 13. 101) the sense is general; so that $\delta\tau\epsilon\ \kappa'$ is admissible in six only (Il. 7. 335, 459., 8. 373, 475, Od. 2. 374., 4. 477). It cannot be an accident that there are so many cases of $\delta\tau'\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ where Homeric usage requires the pure Subj., and no similar cases of $\delta\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\epsilon\nu$: but for that very reason we cannot correct them by reading $\delta\tau\epsilon\ \kappa'$. Meanwhile no better solution has been proposed, and we must be content to note the 16 places as in all probability corrupt or spurious.

It is one thing, however, to find that $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ has encroached upon $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ in Homer, and another thing to show that there are no uses of $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ which belong to the primitive Homeric language.

The restoration of $\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$ is generally regarded as especially easy in the combination $\omicron\kappa\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$, for which $\omicron\tilde{\alpha}\ \kappa\epsilon\nu$ can always be written without affecting either sense or metre. The change, however, is open to objections which have not been sufficiently considered. It will be found that $\omicron\kappa\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ occurs 61 times in the ordinary text of Homer: while $\omicron\tilde{\alpha}\ \kappa\epsilon\nu$ occurs 9 times, and $\omicron\tilde{\alpha}\ \kappa\epsilon$ 7 times. Now of the forms $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ and $\kappa\epsilon$ the first occurs in the Iliad 272 times, the second 222 times. Hence, according to the general laws of probability, $\omicron\tilde{\alpha}\ \kappa\epsilon\nu$ and $\omicron\tilde{\alpha}\ \kappa\epsilon$ may be expected to occur in the same proportion: and in the ordinary text this is the case (9:7). But if every $\omicron\kappa\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ were changed into $\omicron\tilde{\alpha}\ \kappa\epsilon\nu$, there would be 70 instances of $\omicron\tilde{\alpha}\ \kappa\epsilon\nu$ against 7 of $\omicron\tilde{\alpha}\ \kappa\epsilon$. This clearly could not be accidental: hence it follows that $\omicron\kappa\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ must be retained in all or nearly all the passages where it now stands.* And if $\omicron\kappa\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ is right, we may infer that the other instances of $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ with a negative—22 in number—are equally unassailable.

Another group of instances in which $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ is evidently primitive consists of the dactylic combinations $\delta\varsigma\ \pi\epsilon\rho\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$, $\eta\ \pi\epsilon\rho\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$, $\epsilon\iota\ \pi\epsilon\rho\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$. Van Leeuwen would write $\delta\varsigma\ \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\ \pi\epsilon\rho$, &c.; but in Homer $\pi\epsilon\rho$ usually comes immediately after the Relative or $\epsilon\iota$, and before $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ (§ 365). Similarly $\omicron\delta\delta\epsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ (Il. 24. 566) and $\tau\acute{o}\phi\rho\alpha\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ (Od. 2. 77) cannot be changed into $\omicron\delta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \kappa\epsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, $\tau\acute{o}\phi\rho\alpha\ \kappa\epsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, since the order $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \kappa\epsilon\nu$ is invariable in Homer. In these uses, accordingly, $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ may be defended by an argument which was inapplicable to $\omicron\kappa\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$, viz. the impossibility of making the change to $\kappa\epsilon\nu$.

The same may be said of the forms in which $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ occurs under the ictus of the verse, preceded by a short monosyllable ($\cup\text{ }^{\prime}$), as—

Il. 1. 205 $\eta\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \tilde{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\lambda\eta\rho\iota\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\chi'\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu\ \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \theta\upsilon\mu\omicron\nu\ \omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\eta$.

Od. 2. 76 $\epsilon\iota\ \chi'\ \tilde{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \gamma\epsilon\ \phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\iota\tau\epsilon,\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\chi'\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu\ \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\iota\varsigma\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\eta$.

Il. 9. 77 $\tau\iota\varsigma\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\ \gamma\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\iota\epsilon$ (so $\tau\iota\varsigma\ \tilde{\alpha}\nu$, Il. 24. 367,
Od. 8. 208., 10. 573).

* It will be seen that the argument is of the same kind as that by which it was shown above (§ 283 b) that $\tau\epsilon$ must have been often changed into $\kappa\epsilon$. The decisive fact in that case was the excessive occurrence of $\kappa\epsilon$: here it is the absence of any such excess which leads us to accept the traditional text.

Π. 4. 164 ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὅτ' ἄν ποτ' κτλ. (cp. I. 519., 4. 53., 6. 448., 9. 101).

8. 406 ὅφρ' εἰδῆ γλαυκῶπις ὅτ' ἄν ᾧ πατρὶ μάχηται (= 420).

So καὶ ἄν and τότ' ἄν (see the instances, § 363, 2, *c*), σὺ δ' ἄν (Π. 6. 329), ὅς ἄν (Od. 21. 294, cp. Od. 4. 204., 18. 27, Π. 7. 231). In this group, as in the last, we have to do with recurring forms, sufficiently numerous to constitute a *type*, with a fixed rhythm, as well as a certain tone and style.

The combination of ἄν and κεν in the same Clause is found in a very few places, and is probably not Homeric. In four places (Π. 11. 187, 202, Od. 5. 361., 6. 259) we have ὅφρ' ἄν μὲν κεν κτλ., where the place of ἄν is anomalous (§ 365). For οὐτ' ἄν κεν (Π. 13. 127) we should probably read οὐτ' ἄρ κεν, and so in Od. 9. 334 τοὺς ἄρ κε (or rather οὗς ἄρ κε) καὶ ἤθελον αὐτὸς ἐλῆσθαι (cp. Π. 7. 182 δὲν ἄρ' ἤθελον αὐτοί). In Od. 18. 318 ἣν περ γάρ κε should be εἴ περ γάρ κε (*supra*).

363.] Uses of κεν and ἄν. It will be convenient, by way of supplement to what has been said in the chapter on the uses of the Moods, (1) to bring together the chief exceptions to the general rule for the use of κεν or ἄν in Subordinate Clauses; and (2) to consider whether there are any differences of meaning or usage between the two Particles.

1. In Final Clauses which refer to what is still future, the use of κεν or ἄν prevails (§§ 282, 285, 288, 293, 304). But with certain Conjunctions (especially ὥς, ὅπως, ἵνα, ὅφρα) there are many exceptions: see §§ 285–289, 306–307. When the purpose spoken of is not an actual one, but either past or imaginary, the Verb is generally 'pure.'

In Conditional Clauses the Subj. and Opt. generally take κεν or ἄν when the governing Verb is in the Future, or in a Mood which implies a future occasion (Imperative, Subjunctive, Optative with κεν or ἄν). On the other hand in similes, maxims, and references to frequent or *indefinite* occasions, the Particle is not used. But—

(a) Sometimes the pure Subj. is used after a Future in order to show that the speaker avoids referring to a particular occasion: cp. Π. 21. 111 ἔσσεται ἡ ἥως ἡ δέλιη ἡ μέσον ἡμαρ δόπότε . . ἐληται, and the examples quoted in § 289, 2, *a* and § 292, *a*.

(b) In our texts of Homer there are many places in which κεν or ἄν is used although the reference is *indefinite*: but the number is much reduced if we deduct the places in which it is probable that κε (or κ') has crept in instead of τε (τ'): see § 283, *b*. The

real exceptions will generally be found where a Clause is added to restrict or qualify a general supposition already made :—

Il. 3. 25 μάλα γάρ τε κατεσθίει, εἴ περ ἂν αὐτὸν
 σεύωνται (*even in the case when &c.*).

Od. 21. 293 οἶνός σε τρώει μελιηδής, ὅς τε καὶ ἄλλους
 βλέπτει, ὅς ἂν μιν χανδὸν ἔλῃ (*in the case of him
 who takes it greedily*).

So Il. 6. 225., 9. 501, 524., 20. 166, Od. 15. 344., 19. 332 (§§ 289, 292, 296). In these places we see the tendency of the language to extend the use of *κεν* or *ἂν* beyond its original limits, in other words, to state indefinite cases as if they were definite—a tendency which in later Greek made the use of *ἂν* universal in such Clauses, whether the event intended was definite or not.

The change is analogous to the use of the Indicative in a general Conditional protasis; when, as Mr. Goodwin expresses it, 'the speaker refers to one of the cases in which an event *may* occur as if it were the only one—that is, he states the general supposition as if it were particular' (*Moods and Tenses*, § 467). The loss of the Homeric use of *τε*, and the New Ionic use of *ὃ ἢ τό* as a Relative with indefinite as well as definite antecedents, are examples of the same kind.

2. Up to this point the Particles *κεν* and *ἂν* have been treated as practically equivalent. There are however some differences of usage which remain to be pointed out.

(a) In *Negative Clauses* there is a marked preference for *ν*. In the ordinary text of the *Iliad* *ἂν* is found with a negative 53 times (nearly a third of the whole number of instances), *κεν* is similarly used 33 times (about one-twentieth). The difference is especially to be noticed in the Homeric use of the Subj. as a kind of Future (§§ 275, 276). In affirmative clauses of this type *κεν* is frequent, *ἂν* very rare: in negative clauses *ἂν* only is found.

(b) *κεν* is often used in two or more successive Clauses of a Sentence: *e.g.* in both protasis and apodosis, as—

Il. 1. 324 εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώρῃσιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι κτλ.

In Disjunctive Sentences, as—

Il. 18. 308 στήσομαι, ἣ κε φέρῃσι μέγα κράτος ἢ κε φεροίμην.

Od. 4. 692 ἄλλον κ' ἐχθαίρῃσι βροτῶν, ἄλλον κε φιλοίῃ.

And in parallel and correlative Clauses of all kinds:—

Il. 3. 41 καὶ κε τὸ βουλοίμην καὶ κεν πολλὸν κέρδιον εἴη.

23. 855 ὅς μὲν κε βάλλῃ . . ὅς δέ κε μηρίνθοιο τύχῃ, κτλ.

Od. 11. 110 τὰς εἰ μὲν κ' ἀσινέας ἑάαθς νόστου τε μέδῃαι,
καὶ κεν ἔτ' εἰς Ἰθάκην κακὰ περ πάσχοντες ἴκοισθε
εἰ δέ κε σίῃται κτλ.

ἄν, on the other hand, is especially used in the *second* of two parallel or connected Clauses: as—

Il. 19. 228 ἀλλὰ χρὴ τὸν μὲν καταθάπτειν ὅς κε θάνησι . .
ὅσσοι δ' ἂν πολέμοιο περὶ στυγεροῖο λήπωνται κτλ.

Od. 19. 329 ὃς μὲν ἀπηνῆς αὐτὸς ἔη καὶ ἀπηνέα εἰδῆ . .
ὃς δ' ἂν ἀμύμων αὐτὸς ἔη κτλ.

So Il. 21. 553 εἰ μὲν κεν . . εἰ δ' ἂν κτλ.; Il. 3. 288 ff. εἰ μὲν κεν
εἰ δέ κε—εἰ δ' ἂν (the last an alternative to the second).

The only instance of ἄν in two parallel Clauses is—

Od. 11. 17 οὔθ' ὀπότ' ἂν στείλῃσι πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα
οὔθ' ὅτ' ἂν ἀψ' ἐπὶ γαίαν κτλ.

and there we ought to read ὁπότε στείλῃσι, according to the regular Homeric use of the Subj. in *general* statements (§ 289, 2, a).

(c) There are several indications of the use of ἄν as a more *emphatic* Particle than κεν. Thus the combination ἦ τ' ἄν *surely in that case* occurs 7 times in the Iliad, ἦ τέ κεν only twice. Compare the force of καὶ ἄν in—

Il. 5. 362 (= 457) ὃς νῦν γε καὶ ἂν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο

Od. 6. 300 ρεῖα δ' ἀρίγνωτ' ἐστί, καὶ ἂν πάϊς ἡγήσαιο.

So Il. 14. 244 ἄλλον μὲν κεν . . ρεῖα κατεννήσαιο, καὶ ἂν ποταμοῖο
ῥέεθρα Ὠκεανοῦ *I would put any other to sleep, even Oceanus, &c.*

Cp. also τότε ἄν (*then indeed, then at length*), in—

Il. 18. 397 τότε ἂν πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῶ.

22. 108 ἐμοὶ δὲ τότε ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη κτλ.

24. 213 τότε ἂν τιτὰ ἔργα γένοιτο.

Od. 9. 211 τότε ἂν οὐ τοι ἀποσχέσθαι φίλον ἦεν.

And τίς ἂν (*quies tandem*) in Il. 9. 77 τίς ἂν τάδε γηθήσειεν; Il. 24.
367 τίς ἂν δὴ τοι νόος εἴη; Od. 8. 208 τίς ἂν φιλέοντι μάχοιτο;
Od. 10. 573 τίς ἂν θεὸν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα κτλ.

The general effect of these differences of usage between the two Particles seems to be that ἄν is used either in an *adversative* sense—with a second or opposed alternative—or when greater *emphasis* has to be expressed.

This account of the matter is in harmony with the predominance of ἄν in negative sentences. When we speak of an event as *not happening* in certain circumstances, we generally do so by way of contrast to the *opposite* circumstances, those in which it will happen; as οὐκ ἂν τοι χαλᾶσιν κίθαρις *the lyre will not avail you (viz. in battle—whatever it may do elsewhere)*.

The *accent* of the Particles must not be overlooked as a confirmation of the view now taken. Evidently ἄν is more likely to convey emphasis than the enclitic κεν. We may find an analogy

in the orthotone and adversative δέ, which stands to τε and the correlated τε—τε somewhat as we have supposed ἄν to stand to κεῖν and κεῖν—κεῖν.

364.] Original meaning of ἄν and κεῖν. The identity of the Greek ἄν with the Latin and Gothic *an* has been maintained with much force and ingenuity by Prof. Leo Meyer. The following are some of the chief points established by his dissertation.*

1. The Latin *an* is used by the older poets in the second member of a disjunctive question, either direct, as *egone an ille injurie facimus?* or indirect, as *utrum scapulae plus an collus calli habeat nescio* (both from Naevius). The use in single questions is a derivative one, and properly implies that the question is put as an alternative: as—

Plaut. Asin. 5. 1, 10 credam istuc, si te esse hilarum videro. AR. An tu me tristem putas? *do you then think me (the opposite, viz.) sad?*

Amph. 3. 3, 8 derides qui scis haec dudum me dixisse per jocum. SO. an illut jocolo dixisti? *equidem serio ac vero ratus.*

In these places † we see how *an* comes to mean *then on the contrary, then in the other case, &c.* So in Naevius, *eho an vicimus?* *what then, have we conquered?*

2. In Gothic, again, *an* is used in questions of an adversative character: as in Luke x. 29 *an hvas ist mis nehvundja* ('he willing to justify himself, said'): and who is my neighbour?' John xviii. 37 *an nuh thiudans is thu* 'art thou a king then?'

3. These instances exhibit a close similarity between the Latin and the Gothic *an*, and suggest the possibility of a Disjunctive Particle (*or, or else*) coming to express recourse to a second alternative (*if not, then —*), and so acquiring the uses of the Greek ἄν. This supposition, as Leo Meyer goes on to show, is confirmed by the Gothic *aiththau* and *thau*, which are employed (1) as Disjunctive Particles, *or, or else*, and (2) to render the Greek ἄν, chiefly in the use with the Past Indicative. Thus we have, as examples of *aiththau*—

Matth. v. 36 *ni magt ain tagl hveit aiththau svart gataujan* *thou canst not make one hair white or black.*

Matth. ix. 17 *aiththau distaurnand balgeis* (*neither do men put new wine into old bottles*) *else the bottles break.*

John xiv. 2 *niba vēseina, aiththau qvēthjau* *if it were not so, I would have told you* [= it is not so, *else* I would have told you].

John xiv. 7 *ith kunthēdeith mik, aiththau kunthēdeith &c.* *if ye had known me, ye should have known &c.*

Similarly *thau* is used (1) to translate ἤ in double questions, as in Matth. xxvii. 17 *whom will ye that I release unto you, Barabbas or (thau) Jesus?* and after a Comparative (= *than*): frequently also (2) in a Conditional Apodosis, esp. to translate ἄν with Past Tenses, as—

Luke vii. 39 *sa ith vēsi praufētus ufkunthedi thau* *this man, if he were a prophet, would have known.*

* 'AN im Griechischen, Lateinischen und Gothischen, Berlin 1880. The parallel between the Greek ἄν and the Gothic *thau* and *aiththau* was pointed out by Hartung (*Partikeln*, ii. p. 227).

† Taken from Draeger's *Historische Syntax*, i. p. 321, where many other examples will be found.

Sometimes also with the Present (where there is no *άν* in the Greek),—the meaning being that of a solemn or emphatic Future :—

Mark xi. 26 *ith jabai jus ni afēthith, ni thau . . afēthith if ye do not forgive neither will . . forgive (οὐδὲ . . ἀφήσει).*

Matth. v. 20 *ni thau qvimuth (except your righteousness shall exceed &c.) ye shall in no case enter &c. (οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε).*

This use evidently answers to the Homeric *κεν* or *άν* with the Subj. and Fut. Ind. : *ni thau qvimuth = οὐκ άν ἐλθῃτε, ni thau afēthith = οὐδ' άν ἀφήσει.*

4. If now we suppose that *άν*, like *aiththau* and *thau*, had originally two main uses, (1) in the second member of a Disjunctive sentence (= *else, or else*), and (2) in the Conditional apodosis (= *in that case rather*), we can explain the Gothic and Latin *an* from the former, the Greek *άν* from the latter. The idiomatic 'ellipse' in *ἦ γὰρ άν . . ὕστατα λωβήσαιο* *else you would outrage for the last time* will represent an intermediate or transitional use. We can then understand why *άν* should often accompany negatives, and why it should be used in the latter Clause of a sentence. The main difference of the two uses evidently is that in the first the Clauses are co-ordinate, in the second the Clause with *άν* is the apodosis or principal Clause. Thus the two uses are related to each other as the two uses of *δέ* (1) as an adversative Conjunction, (2) in the apodosis.

5. The use of *άν* in Final Clauses may be illustrated by that of *thau* in Mark vi. 56 *bēdun ina ei thau . . attaitōkeina παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἀν . . ἄψωνται* *that they might touch if it were but &c.* With *ἵνα, ὥς, &c.* *άν* may have had originally the same kind of emphasis as *κἀν* in this passage : 'that in any case,' 'that if no more then at least &c.' The use in a Conditional Protasis following the Principal Clause may be compared with Luke ix. 13 *niba thau . . bugjaima (we have no more) except we should buy (= unless indeed we should buy).*

The Particle *κε(v)* is found in Æolic, in the same form as in Homer (see Append. F), and in Doric, in the form *κα*. It is usually identified with the Sanscrit *kam*, which when accented means *well (wohl, gut, bene)*, and as an enclitic appears to be chiefly used with the Imperative, but with a force which can hardly be determined (Delbrück, *A. S.* pp. 150, 503). A parallel may possibly be found in the German *wohl*, but in any case the development of the use of *κε(v)* is specifically Greek.

Order of the Particles and Enclitic Pronouns.

365.] The place of a Particle in the Homeric sentence is generally determined by stricter rules than those which obtain in later Greek : and similar rules are found to govern the order of the enclitic Pronouns and Adverbs.

1. The two enclitics *περ* and *γε*, when they belong to the first word in a clause, come before all other Particles. Hence we have the sequences *εἰ περ γάρ—εἰ περ άν—τοῦ περ δή—πρόθεόν γε μὲν, &c.* Exceptions are to be found in Il. 9. 46 *εἰς ὃ κέ περ Τροίην διαπέρσομεν* (read perhaps *εἰς ὅτε περ*), Il. 7. 387 *εἰ κέ περ ὕμμι . . γένοιτο*, Od. 3. 321 *ὅθεν τέ περ*, Il. 8. 243 *αὐτοὺς δὴ περ ἔασον*.

2. *μέν* and *δέ*, also *τε* in its use as a *connecting* word, come before other Particles. Hence we have *οἱ δὲ δὴ—εἰ δὲ κεν—ἐγὼ δὲ κέ τοι—εἰ δ' ἄν—οὐ μὲν γάρ—οὔτε κε—οὔτ' ἄρα*, &c.

μέν may be placed later when it emphasises a particular word, or part of a clause, especially in view of a following clause with *δέ*, as *Π.* 9. 300 *εἰ δὲ τοι Ἀτρεΐδης μὲν ἀπήχθετο . . σὺ δ' ἄλλους περ κτλ.*, *Od.* 4. 23., *II.* 385., 18. 67, &c.; and in such collocations as *σοὶ δ' ἢ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ κτλ.*, *ἐνθ' ἢ τοι τοὺς μὲν κτλ.* Cp. also *Od.* 15. 405 *οὐ τι περιπληθὺς λίην τόσον, ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ μὲν.*

The form *ὄφρ' ἂν μὲν κεν* is probably corrupt, see § 362 *ad fin.*

3. Of the remaining Particles *γάρ* comes first: as *ἦ γάρ κε—τίς γάρ κε—εἰ περ γάρ κε—τόφρα γὰρ ἄν—ὥς γάρ νύ τοι*, &c. Among the other Particles note the sequences *καὶ νύ κεν—ἐξ ἄρα δὴ—ὀππότε κεν δὴ—ἦ ῥά νυ—τίς τοι νυ*. But *ἄρα* is sometimes put later in the clause, as *ὥς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο*, cp. *Π.* 5. 748 *Ἥρη δὲ μάλιστα θοῶς ἐπιμαλετ' ἄρ' ἵππους.*

τε in its *generalising* use comes after other Particles: hence *δέ τε—μὲν τε—γάρ τε—ἀλλὰ τε—δ' ἄρα τε—ὅς ῥά τε—οὔτ' ἄρ τε—οὐ νύ τε*.

4. The Indefinite *τις* and the corresponding Adverbs, *που, πως, πῶ, ποτε*, &c. follow the Particles. Hence we have *ὅτε κεν τις—αἶ κεν πως—ὄτ' ἂν ποτε—ὅν ῥά τις—δὴ που—νύ που—ἦ πού τί σε*, &c.

But *τε* follows *τις* (§ 332), as in *καὶ γάρ τίς τε, ὅς τίς τε*. And sometimes *ὅς τις* is treated as a single word, as in *ὅν τινα μὲν* (*Π.* 2. 188), *ὅς τις δέ* (*Π.* 15. 743), *ὅς τίς κε* (*Π.* 10. 44, *Od.* 3. 355). Similarly we find *εἰ ποτε* in the combination *εἰ ποτε δὴ*, as well as the more regular *εἰ δὴ ποτε*.

τις sometimes comes later, as *Π.* 4. 300 *ὄφρα καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλων τις κτλ.*, especially after a Gen. which it governs, as *Π.* 13. 55 *σφῶν δ' ᾧδε θεῶν τις κτλ.*; cp. also *Π.* 22. 494 *τῶν δ' ἐλεησάντων κοτύλην τις τυτθὸν ἐπέσχευ*, and *Od.* 21. 374.

So *ποτε*, as in *Π.* 4. 410 *τῷ μὴ μοι πατέρας ποθ' ὁμοίῃ ἐνθεο τιμῇ*, *Π.* 6. 99 *οὐδ' Ἀχιλλῆά ποθ' ᾧδε κτλ.*, *Π.* 10. 453, *Od.* 2. 137. In these places *ποτε* seems to be attracted to an emphatic word. Cp. *που* in *Π.* 12. 272, *ποθεν* in *Od.* 18. 376.

5. The enclitic Personal Pronouns come after the Particles and Pronouns already mentioned: *οὐ ποτέ με—ἦ πῇ με—οὐδέ νύ πῶ με—οὐ γάρ πῶ ποτέ μοι—ἐγὼ δέ κέ τοι—ἐπεὶ ἄρ κέ σε—ὀππότε κέν μιν—αἶ κεν πῶς μιν—οὐ γάρ πῶ σφιν—ἦ πού τίς σφιν*, &c.

Sometimes however an enclitic form follows the emphatic Pronoun *αὐτός*: as *Π.* 5. 459 *αὐτὰρ ἐπειτ' αὐτῷ μοι ἐπέσσυτο*, *Π.* 22. 346 *αἶ γάρ πως αὐτόν με κτλ.*

Occasionally an enclitic is found out of its place at the end of

a line which has the bucolic caesura: II. 3. 368 οὐδ' ἐβαλὼν μιν (v. l. οὐδ' ἐδάμασσα), 5. 104 εἰ ἐτεόν με, 7. 79 ὄφρα πυρός με, 11. 380 ὥς ὄφελόν τοι: so with τις, II. 4. 315 ὥς ὄφελέν τις; and without bucolic caesura, II. 17. 736 ἐπὶ δὲ πτόλεμος τέτατό σφιν.

6. The negative Particles οὐ and μή, which regularly begin the clause, are often put later in order that some other word may be emphasised, and in that case the Indefinite τις, ποτε, &c. follow οὐ or μή: as μετάλλησάν γε μὲν οὐ τι (for οὐ μὲν τι μετάλλησάν γε), κείνοισι δ' ἂν οὐ τις (for οὐ δ' ἂν τις κείνοισι), σὺ δὲ μή τι, τὸ μὲν οὐ ποτε, &c. Similarly κεν and ἄν are attracted to the negation, as in πληθύν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγώ (for οὐδ' ἂν ἐγὼ πληθύν), and when the negative is repeated, as in οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ κεν κτλ.: cp. Od. 15. 321 ὀρητοσύνη οὐκ ἂν μοι ἐρίσσειε βροτὸς ἄλλος.

7. The place of the enclitic is perhaps explained by the pause of the verse in Od. 15. 118 ὅθ' ἐδς δόμος ἀμφεκάλυψε | κείσέ με νοστήσαντα, Od. 14. 245 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα | Αἰγυπτόνδε με κτλ. (unless we read κείσ' ἐμέ, Αἰγυπτόνδ' ἐμέ, cp. Od. 16. 310); and so in—

II. 1. 205 ἧς ὑπεροπλήσι τάχ' ἂν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσση.

1. 256 ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυμῷ.

5. 362 Τυδείδης, ὃς νῦν γε καὶ ἂν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο.

22. 108 ὡς ἐρέουσιν· ἐμοὶ δὲ τότε' ἂν πολὺν κέρδιον εἶη.

Od. 1. 217 ὡς δὴ ἐγὼ γ' ὄφελον μάκαρός νύ τευ ἔμμεναι νιός.

The second half of the line is treated as a fresh beginning of a sentence.

Without assuming that the Homeric usage as to the place of Particles and Enclitics is invariable, we may point out that in several places where these rules are violated the text is doubtful on other grounds. Thus—

II. 3. 173 ὡς ὄφελεν θάνατός μοι ἄδειν. Read ὡς μ' ὄφελεν θάνατος φαδεῖν: for the elision μ(οι) cp. II. 6. 165 ὅς μ' ἔθελεν φιλότῃ μιγήμεναι (§ 376).

II. 6. 289 ἐνθ' ἔσαν οἱ πέπλοι κτλ. Read ἐνθα f' ἔσαν (see § 376). Similarly in II. 20. 282 καὶ δ' ἄχος οἱ χύτο Van Leeuwen reads καὶ δέ f' ἄχος χύτο.

Od. 1. 37 ἐπεὶ πρό οἱ εἶπομεν ἡμεῖς. Bekker would omit πρό (Hom. Bl. ii. 21).

Od. 2. 327 ἐπεὶ νύ περ ἵεται αἰνῶς (read νύ τε ἵεται?).

Od. 15. 436 ὄρκῳ πιστωθῆναι ἀπήμονά μ' οἶκαδ' ἀπάξειν. Omit μ'.

Od. 11. 218 ἀλλ' αὕτη δίκη ἐστὶ βροτῶν, ὅτε κέν τε θάνωσιν, with v. l. (in five MSS.) ὅτε τίς κε θάνησιν. Read ὅτε τίς τε θάνησιν (§ 289 ad fin.).

II. 20. 77 τοῦ γὰρ βα μάλιστά ἐθυμὸς ἀνάγει: so Aristarchus, but the other ancient reading was μάλιστά γε.

II. 21. 576 εἰ περ γὰρ φθάμενός μιν ἦ οὐτάση κτλ.: for μιν the 'city-editions' had τις, but neither word is needed.

Od. 7. 261 (= 14. 287) ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ὀγδοὺν μοι ἐπιπλόμενον ἔτος ἦλθεν: Dind. reads ὀγδόατον, to avoid the unusual synizesis. Read ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μ' ὀγδων: an earlier ὀγδωος (= Lat. *octāvus*) is almost necessary to account for ὀγδοος (Brugmann, *M. U. v.* 37).

Π. 5. 273 εἰ τοῦτω κε λάβοιμεν κτλ. For κε (without meaning here) read γε.

Π. 14. 403 ἐπεὶ τέτραπτο πρὸς ἰθὺ οἱ. The sense seems to require πρὸς ἰθύν in the direction of his aim, cp. πᾶσαν ἐπ' ἰθύν for every aim, ἀν' ἰθύν straight onwards (Π. 21. 303, Od. 8. 377).

Π. 24. 53 μὴ . . νεμεσσηθέμεν οἱ ἡμεῖς. Read-θήμεν, omitting οἱ.

A less strict usage may be traced in the 10th book of the Iliad: cp. l. 44 ἢ τίς κεν, 242 εἰ μὲν δὴ ἑταρόν γε κελεύετε μ' αὐτὸν ἐλίσθαι, 280 νῦν αὖτε μάλιστά με φίλαι, 344 ἀλλ' ἰῶμέν μιν, 453 οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα σὺ πῆμά ποτ' ἔσσεαι. The subject, however, needs more detailed investigation.

CHAPTER XIV.

METRE AND QUANTITY.

The Hexameter.

366.] The verse in which the Homeric poems are composed—the *heroic hexameter*—consists of six *feet*, of equal length, each of which again is divided into two equal parts, viz. an accented part or *arsis* (on which the rhythmical beat or *ictus* falls), and an unaccented part or *thesis*. In each foot the *arsis* consists of one long syllable, the *thesis* of one long or two short syllables; except the last *thesis*, which consists of one syllable, either long or short.

The fifth *thesis* nearly always consists of two short syllables, thus producing the characteristic — ∪ ∪ — ∪ which marks the end of each hexameter.

The last foot is probably to be regarded as a little shorter than the others, the time being filled up by the pause at the end of the verse. The effect of this shortening is heightened by the dactyl in the fifth place, since the two short syllables take the full time of half a foot.

367.] **Diaeresis and Caesura.** Besides the recognised *stops* or pauses which mark the separation of sentences and clauses there is in general a slight pause or break of the voice between successive words in the same clause, sufficient to affect the rhythm of the verse. Hence the rules regarding *Diaeresis* and *Caesura*.

By *Diaeresis* is meant the coincidence of the division between words with the division into feet. The commonest place of *diaeresis* in the hexameter is after the fourth foot: as—

ἡρώων αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια | τεῦχε κύνεσσιν.

This is called the *Bucolic Diaeresis*.

Caesura (τομή) occurs when the pause between two words falls within a foot, so as to 'cut' it into two parts. The caesura which separates the arsis from the thesis (so as to divide the foot equally) is called the *strong* or *masculine* caesura: that which falls between the two short syllables of the thesis is called the *weak* or *feminine* or *trochaic* caesura.

The chief points to be observed regarding caesura in the Homeric hexameter are as follows:—

1. There is nearly always a caesura in the third foot. Of the two caesuras the more frequent in this place is the trochaic (τομή κατὰ τρίτον τροχαῖον), as—

ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα | πολύτροπον ὃς μάλα πολλά.

The strong caesura, or 'caesura after the fifth half-foot' (τομή πενθημιμερής), is rather less common: as—

μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, | Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος.

In the first book of the Iliad, which contains 611 lines, the trochaic caesura of the third foot occurs in 356, and the corresponding strong caesura in 247.*

On the other hand, there must be no diaeresis after the third foot; and in the few cases in which the third foot lies wholly in one word there is always a strong caesura in the fourth foot (τομή ἐθνημιμερής), as—

ὃς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπείθεται | μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ
Ἥρη τ' ἠδὲ Ποσειδάων | καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.

The division between an enclitic and the preceding word is not sufficient for the caesura in the third foot: hence in Od. 10. 58 we should read—

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτοιό τ' | ἐπασσάμεθ' ἠδὲ ποτῆτος

not σίτοιό τε πασσάμεθ' (as La Roche).

The remaining exceptions to these rules are—

Π. 1. 179 οἰκαδ' ἴων σὺν νηυσὶ τε σῆς καὶ σοῖς ἐτάροισι,

which is an adaptation of the (probably conventional) form σὺν νηὶ τ' ἐμῇ καὶ ἐμοῖς ἐτάροις (l. 183). We may help the rhythm by taking νηυσὶ τε σῆς closely together, so as to avoid the break in the middle of the line.

Π. 3. 205 ἦδη γὰρ καὶ δεῦρό ποτ' ἦλυθε διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς.

Π. 10. 453 οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα σὺ πῆμά ποτ' ἔσσειαι Ἀργείοισι.

Where ποτέ, as an enclitic, is in an unusual place in the sentence (§ 365, 4), but it is perhaps in reality an emphatic 'one day.' Similarly, in—

Π. 3. 220 φαίης κε ἱακοτόν τέ τιν' ἔμμεναι ἄφρονά τ' αὐτως,
τινα may be slightly emphatic. Or should we read τὸν ἔμμεναι?

Π. 15. 18 ἢ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε τ' ἐκρέμω ὑψόθεν, ἔκ τε ποδοῖν.

We may read ὅτε τε κρέμω: but possibly the peculiar rhythm is intentional, as being adapted to the sense.

* In this calculation no lines are reckoned twice, short monosyllables being taken either with the preceding or the following word, according to the sense.

2. Trochaic caesura of the fourth foot is very rare, and is only found under certain conditions, viz.—

(1) when the caesura is preceded by an enclitic or short monosyllable (such as *μέν, δέ, &c.*); as—

καί κεν τοῦτ' ἐθέλωμι Διὸς γε διδόντος ἀρέσθαι.

(2) when the line ends with a word of four or five syllables; as—

*αὐτὰρ ὁ μῦθος ἔην μετὰ πέντε κασιγνήτησι.
πολλὰ δ' ἄρ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθ' ἔθυσε | μάχη πεδίοιο.*

The commonest form of this kind of caesura (especially in the *Iliad*) is that in which these two alleviations are both present; as—

Θερσίτ' ἀκριτόμυθε, λιγύς περ ἔων ἀγορητής.

The first fifteen books of the *Iliad* contain eleven instances of trochaic caesura in the fourth foot, of which seven are of this form.

In *Il.* 9. 394 the MSS. give—

Πηλεὺς θῆν μοι ἔπειτα γυναῖκα | γαμέσσεται αὐτός.

But we should doubtless read, with Aristarchus,—

γυναῖκά γε μάσσεται αὐτός.

Similarly we should probably read *τὰ δέ μ' οὐκ ἄρα μέλλον δήσειν* (*Il.* 5. 205, &c.), instead of *ἐμέλλον*: and conversely *θαλερῇ δ' ἐμιάινετο χαίτη* (*Il.* 17. 439), and *ῥαφαὶ δ' ἐλέλυτο ἱμάτων* (*Od.* 22. 186), instead of *μιάινετο, λέλυντο*. In *Od.* 5. 272 we may treat *ὄψ' ἐ δύνοντα* as one word in rhythm. But it is not easy to account for the rhythm in *Od.* 12. 47 *ἐπὶ δ' οὐατ' ἀλείψαι ἑταίρων*.

The result of these rules evidently is that there are two chief breaks or pauses in the verse—the *caesura* in the third foot, and the *diaeresis* between the fourth and fifth—and that the *forbidden* divisions are the *diaeresis* and *caesura* which lie nearest to these pauses. Thus—

Best caesura — — — — — | — — — — —
Worst diaeresis — — — — — | — — — — —

Again—

Best diaeresis — — — — — | — — — — —
Worst caesura — — — — — | — — — — —

It is also common to find a *diaeresis* with a slight pause after the first foot; cp. the recurring *ὦς φάτο, ὦς ἔφατ', ὦς ὁ γε, αὐτὰρ ὁ*, and forms of address, as *τέκνον, δαιμόνι, ὦ φίλοι, ὦ πόποι, &c.* Hence the occasional hiatus in this place, as *Il.* 2. 209 *ἦχῃ, ὥς κτλ.*, *Il.* 1. 333 *αὐτὰρ ὁ ἔγνω ᾗσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ*.

368.] **Spondaic verses.** The use of a spondee in the fifth

place occurs most commonly in verses which end with a word of four or more syllables, as—

στέμματ' ἔχων ἐν χερσὶν ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος.

*Αρεῖ δὲ ζώνην, στέρνον δὲ Ποσειδάωνι.

It is also found with words of three long syllables, as—

τῷ δ' ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

And once or twice when the last word is a monosyllable: as *νωμῆσαι βῶν* (Il. 7. 238), *ἐστήκει μείς* (Il. 19. 117).

A spondee in the fifth place ought not to end with a word. Hence we should correct the endings *ἦω δῖαν* &c. by reading *ἦα*, and *δήμου φῆμυς* (Od. 14. 239), by restoring the archaic *δήμοο*. In Od. 12. 64 the words *λὺς πέτρῃ* at the end of the line are scanned together.

Words of three long syllables are very seldom found before the Bucolic diaeresis. Examples are:—

Il. 13. 713 οὐ γάρ σφι σταδίῃ | ὑσμίνῃ | μίμνε φίλον κῆρ.

Od. 10. 492 ψυχῇ χρησομένους | Θηβαίον | Τειρεσίαο.

The rarity of verses with this rhythm may be judged from the fact that it is never found with the oblique cases of *ἄνθρωπος* (*ἀνθρώπων* &c.), although these occur about 150 times, and in every other place in the verse: or with *ἀλλήλων* &c., which occur about 100 times.

Syllabic Quantity—Position.

369.] The quantity of a syllable—that is to say, the time which it takes in pronunciation—may be determined either by the length of the vowel (or vowels) which it contains, or by the character of the consonants which separate it from the next vowel sound. In ancient technical language, the vowel may be long by its own *nature* (*φύσει*), or by its *position* (*θέσει*).

The assumptions that all long syllables are equal, and that a long syllable is equal in quantity to two short syllables, are not strictly true of the natural quantity in ordinary pronunciation. Since every consonant takes *some* time to pronounce, it is evident that the first syllables of the words *δφς*, *δφρύς*, *δμφή*, *δμβρος* are different in length; and so again are the first syllables of *ὦτρος*, *ἄτρωνον*. Again, the diphthongs *η*, *ηυ*, &c. are longer than the single vowels *η*, *ω*, &c., and also longer than the diphthongs *ει*, *ευ*, *οι*, *ου*. In short, the poetical ‘quantities’ must not be supposed to answer exactly to the natural or inherent length of the syllables. The poetical or metrical value is founded upon the natural length, but is the result of a sort of compromise, by which minor varieties of quantity are neglected, and the syllables thereby adapted to the demands of a simple rhythm.

It has been shown, however, that the general rule of Position rests upon a sound physiological basis. 'The insertion of a consonant may be regarded as equivalent in respect of time to the change of a short vowel into a long one.' (Brücke, *Die physiologischen Grundlagen der neuhochdeutschen Verskunst*, p. 70; quoted by Hartel).

370.] Position. The general rule is that when a short vowel is followed by two consonants the syllable is long.

Regarding this rule it is to be observed that—

(1) Exceptions are almost wholly confined to combinations of a Mute (esp. a *tenuis*) with a following Liquid. But even with these combinations the general rule is observed in the great majority of the instances.

(2) Most of the exceptions are found with words which could not otherwise be brought into the hexameter: such as Ἀφροδίτη, Ἀμφιτρύων, βροτῶν, τράπεζα, προσήυδα, &c.

(3) The remaining exceptions are nearly all instances in which the vowel is separated by Diaeresis from the following consonants: as Il. 18. 122 καὶ τινᾶ Τρωϊάδων, 24. 795 καὶ τὰ γε χρυσείην.

The chief exceptions in Homer are as follows* :—

τρ : in Ἀμφιτρύων, ἐτράφην (Il. 23. 84—but see the note on § 42 in the Appendix, p. 390), τετράκυκλον (Il. 24. 324), φαρέτρης (Il. 8. 323), Ὀτρυντεύς (Il. 20. 383-4); and in ἀλλότριος (unless we scan -ιγς, -ιγν, &c.).

Before τράπεζα, τρίαῖνα, τρίτη (τρίηκοντα, &c.), τραπέσιον (τράποντο, προ-τραπέσθαι, &c.), τράγους, τροποῖς, τρέφει (Od. 5. 422., 13. 410), τροφοῦ (Od. 19. 489), τρέμον (Od. 11. 527).

Before a diaeresis, καὶ τινὰ Τρωϊάδων (Il. 18. 122).

πρ : in ἀλλοπρόσαλλος (Il. 5. 831); before προσήυδα, πρόσωπον, προίκτης, πρόσω, and other Compounds of πρό and πρόσ (προκείμενα, προσαΐξας, &c.); also before πρὸς ἄλλῃλους, πρὸ ἄστεος, and one or two similar phrases (cp. Il. 13. 799., 17. 726).

Before Πριαμίδης (Il.), πρίν (Il. 1. 97 οὐδ' ὃ γε πρίν κτλ., cp. 19. 313, Od. 14. 334., 17. 597); πρῶτος (Od. 3. 320., 17. 275), προσφάσθαι (Od. 23. 106).

κρ : in δακρύοισι (Od. 18. 173), δακρυπλῶειν (Od. 19. 122), ἐνέκρυψε (Od. 5. 488), κεκρυμμένα (Od. 23. 110).

Before Κρονίων, Κρόνου παῖς, κραταῖς, Κραιαῖς, κράτος μέγα (Il. 20. 121), κράνεια, κρυφήδον, κραδαῖων, κρατευνάων, κρεῖων.

Add Il. 11. 697 εἶλετο κρινάμενος; Od. 8. 92 κατὰ κῤᾶτα (καὶ κῤᾶτα?), 12. 99 δέ τε κῤᾶτί.

βρ : in βροτός and its derivatives, as ἀβρότη, ἀμβίβροτος: also before βραχίων.

δρ : in ἀμφι-δρυφής (Il. 2. 700), and before δράκων, Δρύας, δρόμους. Also Il. 11. 69 τὰ δὲ δράγματα (unless we read δάργματα, as Hartel suggests).

θρ : in ἀλλόθροος (Od. 1. 183, &c.), and before θρόνων, &c. and θρασειάν. Also in Il. 5. 462 ἡγήτορι Θρηκῶν.

* They are enumerated by La Roche, *Homeric Untersuchungen*, pp. 1-41, with his usual care and completeness.

φρ: in Ἀφροδίτῃ: and Od. 15. 444 ἡμῖν δ' ἐπιφράσσει' ὄλεθρον. Cp. Hes. Op. 655 προπεφραδμένα.

χρ: before χρέος or χρέως (Od. 8. 353): and in Il. 23. 186 ῥοδόεντι δὲ χρίεν, Il. 24. 795 καὶ τὰ γε χρυσεῖην.

τλ: in σχετλίῃ (Il. 3. 414), which however may be scanned --.

κλ: in Πάτροκλε (Il. 19. 287), ἐκλίθῃ (Od. 19. 470—should perhaps be read ἐτέρωσε κλίθῃ), προσέκλινε (Od. 21. 138, 165—read perhaps πρόσκλινε or ἔκλινε): and before Κλυταιμνήστρῃ, Κλεωναί, κλύδων, κληδών, κλιθῆναι (Od. 1. 366). Also, in Od. 12. 215 τύπτετε κληΐδεσσιν, 20. 92 τῆς δ' ἄρα κλαιούσης.

πλ: in the Compounds τειχεσι-πλήτα (Il. 5. 31, 455), πρωτό-πλοος, προσέπλαξε (Od. 11. 583—read perhaps πρόσπλαξε): before Πλάταια, πλέων sailing, πλέων more (Il. 10. 252), πλέον full (Od. 20. 355). Add Il. 9. 382 (=Od. 4. 127) Αἰγυπτίας, ὅθι πλείστα (with v. l. ᾗ πλείστα, cp. Od. 4. 229), and Il. 4. 329 αὐτὰρ ὁ πλησίον.

χλ: in Od. 10. 234 καὶ μέλι χλωρόν, 14. 429 ἀμφὶ δὲ χλαῖναν.

To these have to be added the very few examples of a vowel remaining short before σκ and ξ: viz. —

σκ: before Σκάμανδρος, σκέπαρνον (Od. 5. 237., 9. 391), σκίῃ (Hes. Op. 589).

ξ: before Ζάκυνθος (Il. 2. 634, Od. 1. 246, &c.), Ζέλεια (Il. 2. 824, &c.).

στ: before στέατος in Od. 21. 178, 183—unless it is a case of Synizesis.

A comparison of these exceptions will show that in a sense we are right in attributing them to metrical necessity. There are comparatively few instances in which the two consonants do not come at the beginning of a word of the form υ —, so that the last syllable of the preceding word must be a short one. On the other hand, the extent to which neglect of position is allowed for metrical convenience is limited, and depends on the *natural quantity* of the consonants in question, *i. e.* the actual time occupied by their pronunciation. Sonant mutes (*mediae*) are longer than surd mutes (*tenues*); gutturals are longer than dentals or labials; and of the two liquids λ is longer than ρ. Thus shortening is tolerably frequent before πρ and τρ, less so before κρ, πλ, κλ, θρ, χρ. With other combinations of mute and liquid, as φρ, βρ, δρ, and with σκ and ξ, it seems to be only admitted for the sake of words which the poet was absolutely compelled to bring in: such as Ἀφροδίτῃ, Σκάμανδρος, Ζάκυνθος, βροτός, with its compounds, &c. No exceptions are found before γρ, γλ, φλ, κν, κμ, or any combination other than those mentioned. In short, the harshness tolerated in a violation of the rule usually bears a direct relation to its necessity. It was impossible to have an Iliad without the names Aphrodite and Scamander, but these are felt and treated as exceptions.

The word ἀνδρότης, which appears in the fixed ending λιποῦσ' ἀνδρότητα καὶ ᾗβην, should probably be written ἄδρότης. As the original μρ of βροτός becomes either μβρ (as ἄμβροτος, φθισί-μβροτος), or βρ (as νδξ ἄδρότης, ἀμφί-βροτος), so νρ might become νδρ (as ἀνδρός), or δρ. So perhaps Ἐνναλίῳ ἀνδρείφοντῃ should be Ἐνναλίῳ ἀδρείφοντῃ (υ υ —): cp. ἀνδρε-φόνος (Hdn. ap. Eustath. 183, 6).

The plea on which a short vowel is allowed before *Σκάμανδρος* and *σκέπαρνον* may be extended, as Fick points out (*Bezz. Beitr.* xiv. 316), to some forms of *σκίδνημι* now written without the *σ*, viz. *κέδασθεν* (Il. 15. 657), *κέδασθέντες*, &c. Metrical necessity, however, would not justify the same license with *σκίδναται* (*ἐπικίδναται* Il. 2. 850, &c.), *ἐ-σκίδνατο*, *ἐ-σκέδασσε* (for which *ἐσκέδασε* is available).

Neglect of Position is perceptibly commoner in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*. Apart from cases in which the necessities of metre can be pleaded, viz. proper names and words beginning with *σ* -, it will be found that the proportion of examples is about 3 : 1. It will be seen, too, that some marked instances occur in Books 23 and 24 of the *Iliad*. In *Hesiod* and the *Homeric Hymns* the rule is still more lax. Thus in *Hesiod* a vowel is allowed to be short before *κν* (*Op.* 567, *Fr.* 95), and *πν* (*Theog.* 319). In the scanty fragments of the *Cyclic poets* we find *πέπρωται* (*Cypria*), *πάτρι* (*Little Iliad*), *Ἀγχίσαιο κλυτὸν κτλ.* (*ibid.*), *ἄκριβέα* (*Iliupersis*).

371.] Lengthening before ρ, λ, μ, ν, σ, δ. There are various words beginning with one of these letters (the liquids ρ, λ, μ, ν, the spirant σ, and the *media* δ), before which a short final vowel is often allowed to have the metrical value of a long syllable. Initial ρ appears always to have this power of lengthening a preceding vowel; but in the case of the other letters mentioned it is generally confined to certain words. Thus we have examples before—

λ, in *λίσσομαι*, *λήγω*, *λείβω*, *λιγύς*, *λιαρός*, *λιπαρός*, *λίσ*, *λαπάρη*, *λόφος*, and occasionally in a few others: but not (*e.g.*) in such frequently occurring words as *Λύκιος*, *λέχος*, *λείπω*.

μ, in *μέγας*, *μέγαρον*, *μοῖρα*, *μαλακός*, *μέλος*, *μελίη*, *μάστιξ*, *μόθος*: but not (*e.g.*) *μάχομαι*, *μένος*, *μέλας*, *μάκαρ*, *μῦθος*.

ν, in *νευρή*, *νέφος*, *νιφάς*, *νύμφη*, *νότος*, *νητός*, *νύσσα*: once only before *νηῦς* (Il. 13. 472): not before *νέκυς*, *νόος*, *νέμεσις*, &c.

σ, in *σέω*, *σάρξ*: once before *σύ* (Il. 20. 434), and once before *συφεός* (*Od.* 10. 238).

δ, in *δέος*, *δεινός*, *δεί-σας* &c. (Stem *δFei-*), *δήν*, *δηρόν* (§ 394).

This lengthening, it is to be observed, is almost wholly confined to the syllables which have the metrical ictus: the exceptions are, *πολλὰ λίσσομένη* (Il. 5. 358, so Il. 21. 368., 22. 91), *πυκνὰ ῥωγαλέην* (*Od.* 13. 438, &c.), *πολλὰ ῥυστάεσκεν* (Il. 24. 755). Further, it is chiefly found where the sense requires the two words to be closely joined in pronunciation: in particular—

(1) In the final vowel of Prepositions followed by a Case-form: as *ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι*, *ποτὶ λόφον*, *ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσι*, *κατὰ μοῖραν*, *ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ*, *κατὰ μόθον*, *διὰ νεφέων*, *ἀπὸ νευρήφω*, *κατὰ συφεοῖσιν*, *κατὰ δεινούς*, *ἐπὶ δηρόν*, and similar combinations.

(2) In fixed phrases: *ὥς τε λῖς* (Il. 11. 239., 17. 109., 18. 318), *κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως* (*Od.* 10. 201, &c.), *ἀπήμονά τε λιαρὸν τε* (Il. 14. 164, &c.), *καλή τε μεγάλη τε*, *εἰδός τε μέγεθός τε*, *Τρῶες δὲ μεγά-*

θυμοι, τρίποδα μέγαν, Πηλιάδα μελίην, ὥς τε νιφάδες, σὺν δὲ νεφέεσσι κάλυψε, ὅτε σεύαιτο, οὐ τι μάλα δῆν, and the like.

These facts lead us to connect the lengthening now in question with the peculiar *doubling of the initial consonant* which we see in Compounds, as ἀπο-ρρίπτω, ἐϋ-ρροος, ἄ-ρρηκτος, τρί-λλιστος, ἐϋ-μμελής, ἀγά-ννιφος, ἐπι-σσεύω, ἐϋ-σσελμος, ἄ-δδεής: and after the Augment (§ 67), as ἔ-ρριψα, ἔ-ρρηξα, ἔ-ρρεον, ἔ-λλίσσεται, ἔ-μμορε, ἔ-ννεον, ἔ-σσενα, ἔ-δδεια (so the MSS., but Aristarchus wrote ἔδεια). The words and stems in which this doubling occurs are in the main the same as those which lengthen a preceding final vowel: and the explanation, whatever it be, must be one that will apply to both groups of phenomena.

With most of these words the lengthening of a preceding vowel (or doubling of the consonant, as the case may be) is optional. But there is no clear instance in Homer of a short vowel remaining short before the root δφει- (*e.g.* in the 2 Aor. δλον, the 1 Aor. ἔδεια, the Nouns δέος, δεινός, δειλός, even the proper names Δεισιήνωρ, &c.), or the Adverb δῆν. The same may be said of ῥάκος, ῥήγνυμι, ῥύομαι, ῥητός, ῥίπτω, ῥίον, also μαλακός, μελίη, νιφάς. Lengthening is also the rule, subject to few exceptions, with λίσσομαι, λόφος, νέφος, νευρή, ῥινός, ῥόος, ῥάβδος, ῥίξα, and some others (La Roche, *H. U.* pp. 47 ff.).

372.] Origin of the lengthening.* The most probable account of the matter is that most of the roots or stems affected originally began with *two consonants*, one of which was lost by phonetic decay. Thus initial ρ may stand for Fρ (as in Fρήγ-νυμι), or σρ (as *σρέω, Sanscrit *sravāmi*): λίς is probably for λFίς (with a weaker Stem than the form seen in λέF-ων): νός is for σνός (Sanskrit. *snushā*): νιφ-άς goes back to a root sneibh (Goth. *snaivns*, snow): μοίρα is probably from a root smer: σέλμα is for σFέλμα (Curt. *s. v.*): and δει- in δει-νός &c. is for δφει- (cp. δέι-δοικα for δέ-δφοικα). It is not indeed necessary to maintain that in these cases the lost consonant was pronounced at the time when the Homeric poems were composed. We have only to suppose that the *particular combination* in question had established itself in the usage of the language before the two consonants were reduced by phonetic decay to one. Thus we may either suppose (*e.g.*) that κατὰ ῥόον in the time of Homer was still pronounced κατὰ σρόον, or that certain combinations—κατα-σρέω, ἐϋ-σροος, κατὰ σρόον, &c.—passed into κατα-ρρέω, ἐϋ-ρροος, κατὰ ῥρόον (or κατὰ ῥόον). There are several instances in which a second form of a word appears in combinations of a fixed type. Thus we have

* On this subject the chief sources of information are, La Roche, *Homerische Untersuchungen* (pp. 49–65); Hartel, *Homerische Studien* (Pt. i. pp. 1–55); and Knös, *De Digammo Homericæ Quaestiones* (Pt. iii. 225 ff.).

the form *πόλις*, in *ποτὶ πόλιος*, Ἀχιλλῆα πολίπορθον, &c.: *πόλεμος*, in *μέγα πολέμοιο μεμηλώς*, ἀνὰ πολέμοιο γεφύρας. Similarly a primitive *γδοῦπος* survives in *ἐρί-γδουπος* (also *ἐρί-δουπος*), *ἐ-γδοῦπησε*: and *γνός* in *ἀ-γνοέω*. Cp. also the pairs *σ μικρός* and *μικρός*, *σκίδναμαι* and *κίδναμαι*, *σῆς* and *ῆς*, *ξύν* and *σύν*. It is at least conceivable that in the same way the poet of the *Iliad* said *μοῖραν* and also *κατὰ σμοῖραν*, *μειδιάων* but *φιλο-σμειδής*, *δὴν ἦν* at the beginning of a line, but *μάλα δ' ἦν* at the end: and so in other cases.

It is true that the proportion of the words now in question which can be proved to have originally had an initial double consonant is not very great. Of the liquids, the method is most successful with initial *ρ*, which can nearly always be traced back to *vr* or *sr*. And among the words with initial *ν* a fair proportion can be shown to have begun originally with *σν* (*νευρή*, *νός*, *νιφάς*, *νέω*, *νύμφη*). The difficulty is partly met by the further supposition that the habit of lengthening before initial liquids was extended by analogy, from the stems in which it was originally due to a double consonant to others in which it had no such etymological ground. This supposition is certainly well founded in the case of *ρ*, before which lengthening became the rule.

373.] Final *ι* of the Dat. Sing. The final *ι* of the Dat. (Loc.) Sing. is so frequently long that it may be regarded as a 'doubtful vowel.' The examples are especially found in lines and phrases of a fixed or archaic type:—

ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἐν δεινῷ σάκει ἔλασ' ὄβριμον ἔγχος.

οὕτω που Διὶ μέλλει ὑπερμενεί φίλον εἶναι (thrice in the *Il.*).

τὸ τρίτον αὐθ' ὕδατι (*Od.* 10. 520., 11. 28).

αὐτοῦ παρ νηὶ τε μένειν (*Od.* 9. 194., 10. 444).

ἦλυθον εἰκοστῷ ἔτει ἐς κτλ. (6 times in the *Od.*).

So in *Ἄλαντι δὲ μάλιστα*, *Ὀδυσσῇ δὲ μάλιστα*, &c. and the fixed epithet *Διὶ φίλος*. Considering also that this vowel is rarely elided (§ 376), it becomes highly probable that *ι* as well as *ι̃* was originally in use.†

It is an interesting question whether these traces of *-ι* as the ending of the Homeric Dat. are to be connected with the occasional *-ι* of the Locative in the Veda (Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 256, p. 610). The Vedic lengthening appears to be one of a group of similar changes of quantity which affect a short final vowel, and which are in their origin rhythmical, since they generally serve to prevent a succession of short syllables (Wackernagel, *Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Composita*, p. 12 ff., quoted by Brugmann *l. c.*). The same thing may evidently be said of the Homeric *-ι* in many of the cases quoted, as

† The priority in this as in so many inferences from Homeric usage belongs (as Hartel notices) to H. L. Ahrens (*Philologus*, iv. pp. 593 ff.).

πατέρι, σάκει, ἔτει. Hence it is probable that the lengthening dates from the Indo-European language, and is not due in the first instance to the requirements of the hexameter. But in such a case as Ὀδυσσῆι it may be that the Greek poet treats it as a *license*, which he takes advantage of in order to avoid the impossible quantities υ--υ (cp. διζυρότερος for the unmetrical διζυρότερος).

374.] Final α. The metrical considerations which lead us to recognise -ι in the Dat. Sing. might be urged, though with less force, in favour of an original -ā as the ending of the Neut. Plur. We have—

Π. 5. 745 (= 8. 389) ἐς δ' ὄχα φλόγα ποσὶ βήσето.

8. 556 φαίνετ' ἀριπρεπέα, ὅτε κτλ.

ΙΙ. 678 (Od. 14. 100) τόσα πῶεα οἶῶν (v. l. μήλων).

20. 255 πόλλ' ἔτεά τε καὶ οὐκί.

21. 352 τὰ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεθρα.

23. 240 ἀριφραδέα δὲ τέτυκται.

24. 7 ὅποσα τολύπευσε.

Od. 9. 109 ἄσπαρτα καὶ ἀνήροτα.

ΙΟ. 353 πορφύρεα καθύπερθ'.

12. 396 ὀπταλέα τε καὶ ὠμά.

14. 343 ῥωγαλέα, τὰ καὶ αὐτός.

23. 225 ἀριφραδέα κατέλεξας.

In the majority of these instances, however, the final α is preceded by the vowel ε, from which it was originally separated by a spirant (ὄχε-σ-α, πορφύρε-ι-α). Cp. Π. Ι. 45 ἀμφηρεφέα τε φαέτρην, 5. 576 Πυλαιμένεα ἐλέτην, 5. 827 Ἀρηῃ τό γε, 14. 329 Περσῆα πάντων, Od. 1. 40 ἐκ γὰρ Ὀρέσταιο τίσις. As two successive vowels are often found to interchange their quantity (βασιλῆα, βασιλέα), so perhaps, even when the first vowel retains its metrical value, there may be a slight transference of quantity, sufficient to allow the final vowel, when reinforced by the *ictus*, to count as a long syllable. Cp. § 375, 3.

The scanning ξα (in Π. 4. 321 εἰ τότε κοῦρος ξα νῦν κτλ., cp. 5. 887, Od. 14. 352) may be explained by transference of quantity, from ῆα.

375.] Short syllables ending in a consonant are also occasionally lengthened in arsis, although the next word begins with a vowel: as—

οὔτε ποτ' ἐς πόλεμον ἄμα λαῶ θωρηχθήναι.

αἰθ' ὄφελος ἄγονός τ' ἔμεναι κτλ.

χερσὶν ὑπ' Ἀργείων φθίμενος ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ.

The circumstances under which this metrical lengthening is generally found differ remarkably, as has been recently

shown,* from those which prevail where short final vowels are lengthened before an initial consonant. In those cases, as we saw (§ 371), the rule is that the two words are closely connected, usually in a set phrase or piece of epic commonplace. In the examples now in question the words are often separated by the punctuation: and where this is not the case it will usually be found that there is a slight pause. In half of the instances the words are separated by the penthemimeral caesura, which always marks a pause in the rhythm. Further, this lengthening is only found in the syllable with the *ictus*. The explanation, therefore, must be sought either in the force of the *ictus*, or in the pause (which necessarily adds something to the time of a preceding syllable), or in the combination of these two causes.

In some instances, however, a different account of the matter has to be given: in particular—

(1) With *ᾤς* following the word to which it refers: as *Il.* 2. 190 *κακὸν ᾤς* (υ — —), and so *θεὸς ᾤς*, *κύες ᾤς*, *ὄρνιθες ᾤς*, *ἀθάνατος ᾤς*, &c. In these instances the lengthening may be referred to the original palatal *ι* or *γ* of the Pronoun (Sansk. *yas*, *yā*, *yad* = *ᾤς*, *ῥι*, *ῑ*). It is not to be supposed that the actual form *ιᾤς* existed in Homeric times: but the habit of treating a preceding syllable as long by Position survived in the group of phrases. Others explain this *ᾤς* as *‘Fῶς* (Sansk. *sva-*), comparing Gothic *svē* ‘as’ (Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* § 98); or *σῶς* (§ 108, 3).

(2) In the case of some words ending with *-ις*, *-ιν*, *-υς*, *-υν*, where the vowel was long, or at least ‘doubtful,’ in Homer.

In *βλοσυρῶπις* and *ῥῆις* the final syllable is long before a vowel even in thesis. So the *ι* may have been long in *θοῦρις* (cp. the phrase *θοῦριν ἐπιειμένους ἀλκήν*): and traces of the same scansion may be seen in the phrases *ἔρις ἄμοτον μεμανῖα*, *Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος*, although *ἔρις*, *μῆτις* are more common.

Final *-υς* (Gen. *-υος*) is long in Feminine Substantives (§ 116, 4), as *ἰθύς aim* (*υ* in thesis, *Il.* 6. 79., 21. 303), *πληθύς* (*Il.* 11. 305), *ἀχλύς* (*Il.* 20. 421), *ἰλύς* (Gen. *-υος*), *βρωτύς* (*Od.* 18. 407) and other Nouns in *-τύς*: also in the Masc. *ἰχθύς*, *νέκυς*, *βότρυς* (*βοτρυδόν*), and perhaps *πέλεκυς* (*Il.* 17. 520).

(3) Where the vowel of the final syllable is preceded by another, especially by a long vowel; as *οἰκῆας ἀλοχόν τε* (*Il.* 6. 366), *Ἀχιλλῆος ὀλοὸν κῆρ* (*Il.* 14. 139), *ὅς λαὸν ἤγειρα* (*Od.* 2. 41), *δμῶες ἐνὶ οἴκῳ* (*Od.* 11. 190), *πλείον ἐλέλειπτο* (*Od.* 8. 475), *χρεῖος ὑπαλύξαι* (with *v. l.* *χρεῖως*, *Od.* 8. 355): and so in *νήας* (*αῖ*, *Il.* 2. 165., 18. 260), *νηός* (*Od.* 12. 329), *Τρώες* (*Il.* 17. 730), *βοός* (*Il.* 11. 776), also *Ἄρηα*, *Περσῆα*, and the other examples given in § 374.

In such cases there is a tendency to lengthen the second

* By Hartel, in the *Homeric Studies* already quoted, i. p. 10.

vowel, as in the Attic forms βασιλέα, Ἀχιλλέως, &c. In Homer we may suppose that the second of the two vowels borrows some of the quantity of the other, so that *with the help of the ictus* it can form the arsis of a foot. Actual lengthening of the second vowel may be seen in Homer in the form ἀπ-ήωρος *hanging loose* (cp. μετ-ήωρος and the later μετ-έωρος) also in δυσάηων (Gen. Plur. of δυσάης).

(4) In the Ending -οῖν of the Dual, as ὁμοῖν (Il. 13. 511., 16. 560, Od. 6. 219), ἵπποῖν, σταθμοῖν: also in νῶιν, σφῶιν. We may compare the doubtful ι of ἡμῖν, ὑμῖν, and the two forms of the Dat. Plur. in Latin (-būs, -bīs). Similarly there are traces of ι in μῖν (Il. 5. 385., 6. 501., 10. 347., 11. 376, &c.). In the case of -οῖν and -ωῖν the account given under the last head would apply.

In a few places it appears as though the 3 Plur. of Secondary Tenses in -ν (for -ντ) were allowed to be long: as ἔφαν ἀπύοντες (Od. 9. 413), καὶ κύνεον ἀγαπάζοντες (Od. 17. 35, &c.), &c. This is confined (curiously enough) to the Odyssey and the Catalogue of the Ships. In the latter it occurs seven times: in the Odyssey eleven times, in the rest of the Iliad once (7. 206).

Elision, Crasis, &c.

376.] A final vowel cut off before a word beginning with a vowel is said to suffer *Elision* (ἐκθλιψις): as μυρὶ Ἀχαιοὺς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε. Whether an elided vowel was entirely silent, or merely slurred over in such a way that it did not form a distinct syllable, is a question which can hardly be determined.

The vowels that are generally liable to elision are α, ε, ο, ι. But—

(1) The ο of δ, τό, πρό is not elided.

Final -ο is not elided in the Gen. endings -οιο, -αο, and very rarely in the Pronouns ἐμεῖο, &c. This however may be merely because the later forms of these endings, viz. -ου, -εω, -ευ, took the place of -οι(ο), -α(ο), -ει(ο) when a vowel followed. In the case of αο this supposition is borne out by the fact that -εω is often found before a vowel, as Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος (l. Πηληϊάδα'): and by the rarity of the contraction of εο to ευ (§ 378*). There is less to be said for elision of -ο in the ending -οιο. That ending in Homer is archaic (§ 149), therefore the presumption is against emendations which increase the frequency of its occurrence. And the cases of -ου remaining long before hiatus are not exceptionally common (Hartel, *H. S.* ii. 6).

(2) The ι of τί, περί is not elided in Homer; regarding τι see § 269. But περί is elided in Hesiod: as περοίχεται, περίαχε.

(3) The -ι of the Dat. Sing. is rarely elided; but see § 105, 1. Exceptions are to be seen in Il. 4. 259 ἦδ' ἐν δαίθ' ὅτε κτλ.; 5. 5

ἀστέρ' ὀπωρινῷ κτλ.; Il. 3. 349., 10. 277., 12. 88., 16. 385., 17. 45., 324., 23. 693., 24. 26, Od. 5. 62, 398., 10. 106., 13. 35., 15. 364., 19. 480. The ι of the Dat. Plur. is often elided in the First and Second Declensions, and in the forms in -σσι of the Third Declension. On the other hand, elision is very rare in the forms in -εσι, -ᾱσι, -ῦσι, &c.

The diphthong -αι of the Person-Endings -μαι, -σαι, -ται, -νται, -σθαι is frequently elided: as βούλομ' ἐγώ, κείσονται ἐν προθύροις, πρὶν λύσασθ' ἐτάρους. But not the -αι of the 1 Aor. Inf. Act. or of the Inf. in -ναι: hence in Il. 21. 323 read τυμβοχόης, not the Inf. τυμβοχοῖσ'.

The diphthong -οι of the enclitic Pronouns μοι and σοι (τοί) is elided in a few places: Il. 6. 165 ὅς μ' ἔθελεν φιλότῃ μιγήμεναι οὐκ ἐθελούσῃ; 13. 481 καὶ μ' οἶφ' ἀμύνετε (so Od. 4. 367); 17. 100 τῷ μ' οὐ τις νεμεσῆσεται; also Il. 1. 170., 9. 673., 13. 544., 23. 310, 579, Od. 1. 60, 347., 23. 21 (Cobet, *Misc. Crit.* p. 345). Other instances may be recovered by conjecture: thus in Il. 3. 173 ὥς ὄφελεν θάνατός μοι ἰδέειν should probably be ὥς μ' ὄφελεν θάνατος ἰδέειν (§ 365); and in Il. 24. 757 νῦν δέ μοι ἐρσῆεις Van Leeuwen reads νῦν δέ μ' ἐερσῆεις.

In the case of the enclitic οἱ ('φοί) elision involved the disappearance of the Pronoun from the later text. In Il. 6. 289 (= Od. 15. 105) ἐνθ' ἔσαν οἱ πέπλοι the original was probably ἐνθα 'F(οί) ἔσαν (cp. Od. 15. 556 ἐνθα οἱ ἦσαν ἕες). In Il. 5. 310 (= 11. 356) ἀμφὶ δὲ ὅσσε κελαυνῇ νύξ' ἐκάλυψε read ἀμφὶ δέ 'F. In Od. 9. 360 ὥς φάτ', ἀτὰρ οἱ αὐτίς, where some MSS. have ὥς ἔφατ', ἀτὰρ οἱ αὐτίς, read αὐτὰρ 'F'.*

377.] **Crasis.** When a final vowel, instead of being elided, coalesces with the initial vowel of the next word, the process is termed *Crasis*.

The use of Crasis in Homer is limited. It is seen in οὔνεκα and τοὔνεκα, also in τᾶλλα for τὰ ἅλλα (Il. 1. 465, &c.), καὶ αὐτός (in Il. 6. 260., 13. 734, Od. 3. 255., 6. 282—the three last being passages where κ' αὐτός for κε αὐτός is inadmissible), and χημεῖς for καὶ ἡμεῖς (Il. 2. 238). In these cases either Crasis or Elision is required by the metre. Most texts also have ὠριστος, οὔμός (Il. 8. 360), ὠτός for ὁ αὐτός (Il. 5. 396), κἀγώ, τῷμ', τῇμῃ: also προῦ- for προ-ε- (in προῦφαινε, προῦχούσας, &c.). But since the full forms ὁ ὠριστος, &c. are equally allowed by the

* J. van Leeuwen, *Mnemos.* xiii. 188 ff. Of the numerous other emendations of this kind which he proposes few are positively required. The style of Homer constantly allows an unemphatic Pronoun to be supplied from the context. Moreover, he frequently proposes to insert enclitics in a part of the sentence in which they seldom occur (§ 365). It would be difficult (e.g.) to find a parallel for ἐπεὶ μ' ἀφέλεσθέ 'φε δόντες or χειρὶ δὲ νεκταρέου φεανού 'F' ἐτίναξε λαβούσα.

metre we cannot but suspect that the spelling with Crasis may be due to later usage. The forms *κάκείνος*, *κάκείσε*, &c. (for *καὶ κείνος*, &c.) are certainly wrong, as *ἐκείνος* is not the Homeric form.

378.] Synzesis is the term used when the two coalescing vowels are written in full, but 'sink together' (*συνίζανω*) into one syllable in pronunciation.

The Particle *δὲ* unites with the initial vowel of a following vowel, especially with *αῦ*, *αὐτός* and *οὕτως* (§ 350); also with *Ἀντιμάχοιο* (Il. 11. 138), *ἀφνειότατος* (Il. 20. 220), *ἀγρην* (Od. 12. 330).

Synzesis is also found with *ἦ*, in the combination *ἦ οὐχ* (Il. 5. 439, &c.), *ἦ εἰς ὃ κεν* (Il. 5. 466), *ἦ εἰπόμεναι* (Od. 4. 682); with *ἐπεὶ οὐ* (Od. 4. 352, &c.); with *μὴ ἄλλοι* (Od. 4. 165); and in—

Il. 17. 89 *ἀσβέστω· οὐδ' ὕδιν λάθην Ἀτρείος*: where we may perhaps read *ἀσβέστω· οὐδ' ὕια λάθ' Ἀτρείος*.

18. 458 *υἱὲ ἔμῳ ὠκυμόρῳ* (one or two MSS. give *υἱ' ἔμῳ*).

Od. 1. 226 *εἰλαπίνῃ ἥῃ γάμος κτλ.*

In Il. 1. 277 *Πηλεΐδῃ ἔθελ'*, and Od. 17. 375 *ὦ ἀρίγνωτε* the case is different: a *short* vowel is absorbed in a preceding long one.

Other examples of Synzesis are to be found in the monosyllabic pronunciation of *εα*, *εο*, *εω*, both in Verbs (§ 57) and Nouns (§ 105, 3). It will be seen that in the cases now in question (apart from some doubtful forms) an E-sound (*η*, *ει*, *ε*) merges in a following *α* or *ο*.

The term Synzesis may also be applied to the monosyllabic pronunciation of the vowels in *Αἰγυπτίῃ* (Od. 4. 229), &c. *σχελίῃ* (Il. 3. 414), *Ἰστιάια* (Il. 2. 537). It has been thought that in these cases the *ι* was pronounced like our *y*: but this is not a necessary inference from the scansion. In Italian verse, for instance, such words as *mio*, *mia* count as monosyllables, but are not pronounced *myo*, *mya*. For *πόλιος* (*υ* — in Il. 2. 811., 21. 567) it is better to read *πόλεος* (§ 107); and for *πόλιας* (Od. 8. 560, 574) *πόλις*. The corresponding Synzesis of *υ* is generally recognised in the word *Ἐνναλίῳ* (commonly scanned *υα* in the phrase *Ἐνναλίῳ ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ*): but see § 370 *ad fin.*

378*.] Contraction. The question of the use of contracted forms has been already touched upon in connexion with the different grammatical categories which it affects: see §§ 56, 81, 105. It will be useful here to recapitulate the results, and to notice one or two attempts which have been made to recover the original usage of Homer in this respect.*

* See especially J. van Leeuwen, *Mnemosyne*, Nov. Ser. xiii. p. 215, xiv. p. 335: and Menrad, *De contractionis et synizeseos usu Homérico* (Monachii, 1886).

1. Contraction is most readily admitted between similar sounds, or when the second is of higher vowel pitch, *i. e.* higher in the scale ο, ω, α, η, ε. Thus we have many instances with the combinations εε, οο, αε, οε; few with εα, αω, αο, still fewer with εω, εο.

2. In most cases in which contraction is freely admitted we find that the sound which originally separated the vowels was the semi-vowel *i* or *y*. In case of the loss of σ it is comparatively rare; with *F* it is probably not Homeric at all (§ 396). Hence (*e. g.*) although it is common with the combinations εε, εει in most Verbs in -εω (§ 56), it is not found in χέω (χέ^εω) and is extremely rare in τρέω (τρέ^σω, see § 29, 6). But it is admitted with loss of σ_k, as in the Gen. ending -ου from -οοσχο {-οχο, -οο), and the Verbs in -εω from stems in -εσ, as νεικέω (νεικε^σω).

(a) On these principles we should expect the 2 Sing. endings -εαι, -εο, -ηαι, -αιο (for -εσαι, &c.) to remain uncontracted; and this view is borne out on the whole by the very careful investigation made by J. van Leeuwen. Omitting the Verbs in -αιω and -εω we find that there are about 522 occurrences of these endings, and that of these 434 present uncontracted forms: while in 66 instances the contracted syllable comes before a vowel, so that it can be written with elision of -αι or -ο (*e. g.* Il. 3. 138 κεκλήσε' ἀκούεις, for κεκλήση: Il. 9. 54 ἐπλε' ἄριστος, for ἐπλευ). In the case of -εο this mode of writing finds some support in the MSS.: *e. g.* ψεύδε' (Il. 4. 404), παύε' (Il. 9. 260, Od. 1. 340), εὔχε' (Il. 3. 430, Od. 4. 752), also ἐπε', read by Aristarchus in Il. 10. 146 (ξπεν MSS.). Against these 500 instances there are only 22 exceptions, 7 in the Iliad and 15 in the Odyssey, some of which can be readily corrected. Thus Il. 4. 264 (= 19. 139) ὄρσεν πόλεμόνδε should be ὄρσο πόλεμόνδε (Nauck): in Il. 2. 367 γνώσκει δ' εἰ ομίτ δὲ (Barnes): in Il. 24. 434 for ὅς με κέλει read ὅς κέλει, and so in Od. 4. 812., 5. 174. In Od. 18. 107 for ἐπαύρη read the Act. ἐπαύρης (Van L.): as in Il. 1. 203 we may retain ἰδης (so the MSS.; Ar. ἰδῆ, —but the corruption lies deeper). The greater frequency of instances in the Odyssey (and in book xxiv of the Iliad) is hardly enough to indicate a difference of usage within the Homeric age.

(b) In the corresponding forms of Verbs in -αιω and -εω there is a concurrence of three vowels, which in our text are always reduced to two syllables, either by contraction, as in αἰδεῖο, μυθεῖαι, νείαι, μνάε, or by hyphaeresis (§ 105), as μυθεῖαι, αἰρεο, ἔκλεο, πώλει (Od. 4. 811). A single vowel appears in πειρά for πειρά-εαι, ἥρω for ἥρά-εο. The metre requires αἰδεῖο, αἰρεο, ἔκλεο, πώλει; for πειρά it allows πειράει (becoming πειρά' in Il. 24. 390, 433, Od. 4. 545). The isolated form ὄρηαι (Od. 14. 343) for ὄρά-εαι should perhaps be ὄρᾱι or ὄράε. If the ending is in its original form it belongs to the Non-Thematic conjugation (§ 19): another example may be found in ὀρήτο (or ὀρητο), read by Zenodotus in Il. 1. 56.

(c) In the Future in -εω (for -εσω) contraction is less frequent than in the Present of Verbs in -εω (-ειω or -εσιω). Forms such as δλείται, καμείται, μαχεῖται, δμείται, κομῶ, κτεριῶ, κτεριοῦσι, evidently could not otherwise come into the verse. In Il. 17. 451 σφῶϊν δ' ἐν γούνεσσι βαλῶ we may read βάλω (Fick).

II. 4. 161 *ἔκ τε καὶ ὀφεί τελεῖ* we should take *τελεῖ* as a Present. The remaining exceptions are, *κτενεῖ* in II. 15. 65, 68 (probably an interpolation), *κατακτενεῖ* in II. 23. 412, and *ἐκφανεῖ* in II. 19. 104.

(d) Similarly in the declension of stems in *-εσ* the ending *-ees* is rarely contracted. In the phrase *φαίνονται* (or *φαίνεσθαι*) *ἐναργεῖς* (II. 20. 131, Od. 7. 201., 16. 161) Fick happily reads *ἐναργές*, to be taken as an adverb. The same remedy is applicable in II. 9. 225 *δαιτὸς μὲν εἰσὶς οὐκ ἐπιδευεῖς*, and II. 13. 622 *ἀλλης μὲν λώβης τε καὶ αἰσχεος οὐκ ἐπιδευεῖς*, where the Nom. Plur. is unexplained: read *οὐκ ἐπιδευές* *there is no lack*.

(e) The contraction of *εο* to *ευ* is rare in the Gen. of stems in *-εσ* (§ 105, 3), but frequent in the Pronominal Genitives *ἐμεῦ* (*μεν*), *σεῦ*, *ἐν*, *τεῦ*. Here again, however, we are struck by the number of cases in which we can substitute the forms in *-ειο* or *-εο*, with elision of *-ο*. In our MSS. the elision actually occurs in *ἐμεί* (II. 23. 789, Od. 8. 462) and *σεῖ* (II. 6. 454, also Hom. H. xxxiv. 19). In II. 17. 173 *νῦν δέ σευ ἄνοσάμην* Zenodotus is said to have read *νῦν δέ σε*, i. e. probably *νῦν δέ σε*. The full forms in *-ειο* or *-εο* occur 121 times, and may be restored without elision 9 times, with elision 56 times. To these we should add the instances in which we may put the form **μεο* (6 times) or *με* (19 times). There remain altogether about fifty-five exceptions, which are discussed by J. van Leeuwen (*Mnemos.* xiii. 215). In the phrase *κέκλυτέ μεν*, which occurs 19 times, he would read *μοι*, according to the Homeric construction (§ 143, 3). So in the formula *κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μεν*, *Ἰθακήσιοι* (5 times in the *Odyssey*), where however we are tempted to restore *ἐμεί* (cp. II. 3. 97 *κέκλυτε νῦν καὶ ἐμείο*). He suggests putting the Dat. for the Gen. also in Od. 10. 485 *οἱ μεν φθινύθουσι φίλον κῆρ*, Od. 15. 467 *οἱ μεν πατέρ' ἀμφεπέοντο*, Od. 16. 92 *ἡ μάλα μεν καταδάπτει' ἀκούοντος φίλον ἦτορ*. In the last passage it is needless to alter the Gen. *ἀκούοντος* (§ 243, 3, d), and we may even read in II. 1. 463 *ἐμοὶ πάρος ἔκλυες εὐξαμένοιο* (cp. II. 16. 531 *ὅττι οἱ ὦκ' ἤκουσε μέγας θεὸς εὐξαμένοιο*). The substitution of the Dat. seems the most probable correction in various places where Leeuwen proposes other changes: Od. 4. 746 *ἐμεῦ δ' ἔλετο μέγαν ὄρκον* (cp. II. 22. 119 *Τρωσὶν δ' αὖ . . ὄρκον ἔλωμαι*), II. 2. 388 *ἰδρώσει μὲν τευ τελαμῶν ἀμφὶ στήθεσφι*, II. 22. 454 *αἱ γὰρ ἀπ' οὐατος εἴη ἐμεῦ ἔπος* (cp. 18. 272); also II. 1. 273., 9. 377., 16. 497., 19. 185., 20. 464., 24. 293, 311, 750, 754, Od. 5. 311., 9. 20., 13. 231., 19. 108., 24. 257; and perhaps II. 19. 137 *καὶ μεν φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεὺς* (unless the *με* of some MSS. is right), so II. 9. 377 and II. 9. 335. In Od. 19. 215 *νῦν μὲν δὴ σεῦ, ξείνε, δῶα περῆσσεσθαι εἰ κτλ.* Leeuwen restores the Acc. *σέ* (as in II. 18. 600). In Od. 17. 421 (= 19. 77) we may perhaps read *καὶ ὅτι κεχρημένος ἔλθοι* (*ὅττι* as in II. 20. 434 *οἶδα δ' ὅτι σὺ μὲν κτλ.*). The remaining exceptions are II. 5. 896 *ἐκ γὰρ ἐμεῦ γένος ἐσσί*, II. 23. 70 *οὐ μὲν μεν ζώντος ἀκήδεις*, II. 24. 429 *δέξαι ἐμεῦ πάρα*, and II. 1. 88 *οὐ τις ἐμεῦ ζώντος κτλ.*, where the contraction *ζώντος* and the Dat. Plur. *κοίῃς* before a consonant are also suspicious (Fick, *Ilias*, p. xvii).

(f) The contraction of *οα*, *οε* (from *οσ-α*, *οσ-ε*) is doubtful in the Nouns in *-ω* and *-ως* (§ 105, 6), but appears in the forms of the Comparative, viz. *ἀμείνω*, *ἀρείω*, *ἀρείους*, *κακίους*, *πλείους*, and *μείζω* (Hesiod). The uncontracted forms in *-οα*, *-οes* do not occur, since the metre allows either *-ω*, *-ους* or else the later *-οα*, *-οες*. But in such a phrase as *ἀμείνω δ' αἰσίμα πάντα* (where Nauck reads *ἀμείνοα*) we may suspect that *ἀμείνοα* was the original form.

(g) Vowels originally separated by *f* are so rarely contracted that instances in our text must be regarded with suspicion. Thus *ἄκων* (*ἀ-φέκων*) should

always be *δέκων*: *ἄτη* (*ἰδῆα*) may be written *ἄτη* except in II. 19. 83 *φρεσὶν ἔμβαλον ἄτριον ἄτην* (where the use of *ἄτριον* as a Fem. is also anomalous, § 119). In II. 3. 100., 6. 356., 24. 28 (where *ἄτης* comes at the end of the line) the better reading is *ἀρχῆς*. *κοῖλος* may be *κόϊλος* (cp. Lat. *cavus*), except in Od. 22. 385. *εἶδον* (*ἔ-φιδον*) may be *εἶδον*, except in four places (II. 11. 112., 19. 292, Od. 10. 194., 11. 162). *πολέες* (Acc. Plur. of *πολύς*) is not uncommon, but should probably be *πολύς* (§ 100): *πολέων* occurs once (II. 16. 655). Other instances with Nouns in *-us* and *-eus* are rare (Nauck, *Mél. gr.-rom.* iii. 219; Menrad, p. 60). The Fem. in *-εία* is not contracted from *-εφία*, *-εία* but comes directly from *-εφία*. So οἶός, οἶών for *ὀφί-ός*, *ὀφί-ών* (cp. *δεσσι* for *ὀ-εσσι*), and *δῖος* for *δίφ-ιος*. *ῥως* and *τέως*, which occur several times in our text, are nearly always followed by a Particle (*μέν*, *περ*, &c.), which has evidently been inserted for the sake of the metre (*ῥως μέν* for *ῥος*, &c.). For *ἀλλοεῖδέα* in Od. 13. 194 we should doubtless read *ἀλλο-ἰδέα* (§ 125, 2).

εἶρυσσα may be from *ἔ-φρυσσα* (but see Schulze in *K.Z.* xxix. 64): as to *ἔαχον*, which has been supposed to stand for *εἶαχον*, from *ἔ-φίφαχον*, see § 31, 1.

The most important example of contraction notwithstanding *f* is the word *παῖς* (*παῖς*, *παιδός*, &c.). Other words which present the same difficulty are: *ἄσε* (Od. 11. 61), *ἄσατο* (II. 19. 95)—in both places Nauck would read *ἄσσε*—*ἀθλοφόρος* (II. 9. 266., 11. 699), *ἀθλεύων* (II. 24. 734), *ἄθλον* (Od. 8. 160), *ἄσαμεν* *we slept* (Od. 16. 367), *ἔῤ* (II. 5. 256) and other forms of *ἔδω* (II. 10. 344., 23. 77, Od. 21. 233), *νέα* (Od. 9. 283), *ρέα* (II. 12. 381., 17. 461., 20. 101, 263), *κρέα* (Od. 9. 347), *χεῖσθαι* (Od. 10. 518), *τιμῆντα* (II. 18. 475), *τεχνῆσσαι* (Od. 7. 110), *ἥλιος* (Od. 8. 271), *ἑωσφόρος* (II. 23. 226), *πλέων* (Od. 1. 184), *τεθνεῶτι* (Od. 19. 331), *πεπτεῶτα*, *-τας* (II. 21. 503, Od. 22. 384), *βεβῶσα* (Od. 20. 14), *νόον* (II. 24. 354), *καιρουσσέων* (Od. 7. 107), the compounds of *ἐννέα*—*ἐννήμαρ*, *ἐννέωρος*, *ἐννεόργυιος*—and the proper names *Εὐρύκλεια* *Ἀντίκλεια* (*-κλεία* Nauck). Some of these may be disposed of by more or less probable emendation: others occur in interpolated passages (*e.g.* *ἥλιος* in the Song of Demodocus): others (as *πλέων*, *τεθνεώς*) may be explained by the loss of *f* before *ω*, *ο* (§ 393). On the whole they are too few and isolated to be of weight against the general usage of Homer.

The general result of the enquiry seems to be that the harshness of a synizesis or a contraction is a matter admitting of many degrees. With some combinations of vowels contraction is hardly avoided, with others it is only resorted to in case of necessity. We have already seen that the rules as to lengthening by Position (§ 370) are of the same elastic character. And as there is hardly any rule of Position that may not be overborne by the desire of bringing certain words into the verse, so there is no contraction that may not be excused by a sufficiently cogent metrical necessity. Thus the synizesis in such words as *Ἰστίαια*, *Αἰγυπτίους*, *χρυσέοισι* stands on the same footing as the neglect of Position with *Σκάμανδρος* or *σκέπαρνον*: and again the synizesis in *τεμένεια*, *ἀσινέας*, or the contraction in *πουνέμενος*, *ἀμφιβαλεῖν* is like the shortening of a vowel before *προσηύδα*, or the purely metrical lengthening of a short vowel (§ 386).

On the same principles harshness of metre may be tolerated for the sake of a familiar phrase: *e.g.* the hiatus *ἄφθιτα αἰεὶ* in

Il. 13. 22 (ἀφθιτον δελ in Il. 2. 46, 186., 14. 238). So when the formula *καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα κτλ.* is used of a goddess (Il. 15. 35, 89) it becomes *καὶ μιν φωνήσασα ἔπεα*. Again the harsh lengthening in *μέροπες ἀνθρώποι* (Il. 18. 288, at the end of the line) is due to the familiar *μερόπων ἀνθρώπων*.

Hiatus.

379.] Hiatus is a term which is used by writers on metre in more than one sense. It will be convenient here to apply it to every case in which a word ending with a vowel or diphthong is followed by a word beginning with a vowel, and the two vowel-sounds are not merged together (as by elision, crasis, &c.) so as to form one syllable for the metre.

It would be more scientific, perhaps, to understand the word *Hiatus* as implying that the two vowels are separated by a break or stoppage of vocal sound, so that the second begins with either the rough or the smooth 'breathing.' Thus it would be opposed to every form of *diphthong* (including *synizesis*), the characteristic of which is that the two vowels are slurred together, by shifting the position of the organs without any perceptible interruption of the current of breath. This definition, however, might exclude the case of a long vowel or diphthong shortened before an initial vowel (as *τὴν δ' ἐγὼ οὐ*, where the final *ω* seems to be partly merged in the following *ου*). Again when a final *ι* or *υ* comes before a vowel without suffering elision, it is probable that the corresponding 'semi-vowel' (= our *y* or *w*) is developed from the vowel-sound, and prevents complete hiatus.

380.] Long vowels before Hiatus. The general rule is that a long final vowel or diphthong coming before a vowel forms a short syllable in the metre. This shortening is very common in Homer: cp. Il. 1. 299 *οὔτε σοὶ οὔτε τῷ ἄλλῳ, ἐπεὶ κτλ.*, where it occurs in three successive feet.

But the natural quantity may be retained before hiatus when the vowel is in the arsis of the foot, as *Ἀτρεΐδῃ Ἀγαμέμνονι, ὅς κ' εἴποι ὅτι κτλ.* And in a few instances a long vowel or diphthong is allowed to remain long in thesis, as Il. 1. 39 *Σμυνθεῦ· εἴ ποτέ τοι κτλ.*

The readiness with which long syllables are allowed before hiatus varies with the several long vowels and diphthongs; partly also it depends on the *pauses* of the sense.

The long diphthongs (as they may be called), viz. *η* and *ω*, are the most capable of resisting the shortening influence of hiatus; next to them are *ευ* and *ου*, and the long vowels *η* and *ω*: while *ει*, *οι* and *αι* are at the other end of the scale. A

measure of this may be gained by observing how often each of these terminations is long before a vowel, and comparing the number with the total number of times that the same termination occurs. Thus it appears that out of every 100 instances of final φ , it is long before hiatus about 23 times. Similarly final $-\eta$ is long 19 times, $-\epsilon\upsilon$ 6·7 times, $-\omicron\upsilon$ 6 times, $-\eta$ 5·7 times, $-\omega$ 4 times, $-\epsilon\iota$ 1·8 times, $-\omicron\iota$ 1·6 times, and $-\alpha\iota$ only 1·3 times. Thus hiatus after φ and η is scarcely avoided, while after $\epsilon\iota$, $\omicron\iota$ and $\alpha\iota$ it is very rare.

In a large proportion of the instances in which a long vowel retains its quantity before hiatus it will be found that the hiatus coincides with a division either in the sense or the rhythm. Of the examples in the arsis of the foot, more than half occur before the penthemimeral caesura, where there is almost always a pause: while in thesis the same thing is chiefly found to occur either after the first foot, as Il. 2. 209 ἦχῃ, ὥς ὅτε κτλ., Od. 11. 188 ἀγρῶ, οὐδὲ κτλ.; or after the fourth foot (in the Bucolic diaeresis).

381.] Shortening of diphthongs before Hiatus. Regarding the nature of the process by which a diphthong before hiatus was reduced to the time or metrical value of a short syllable two probable views have been maintained.

1. Curtius holds that whenever long syllables are shortened by the effect of hiatus something of the nature of *Elision* takes place. Thus η and ω lose the second half of the vowel sound, while $\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\iota$, $\omicron\iota$ lose the ι . In support of this he points to the facts of Crasis: thus καὶ ἐγὼ in becoming κἀγὼ may be supposed to pass through the stage κα ἐγὼ.

2. According to an older view, which has been revived and defended with great ingenuity by Hartel,* the ι or υ in a diphthong is turned into the corresponding spirant; so that καὶ ἐγὼ becomes κα-ι-εγὼ, and ἐκ Πόλου ἐλθὼν becomes ἐκ Πόλο-*f*-ελθὼν.

It is certainly in favour of this latter supposition that it does not oblige us to suppose the frequent elision of the two vowels which in general are the least liable to be elided. The explanation however is not a complete one. It does not account for the shortening of η and φ , which on the principle assumed by Hartel would become $\eta\iota$, $\omega\iota$. On the whole it seems most probable that the shortening in question was effected, for diphthongs as well as for simple long vowels, by a process in which ancient grammarians would have recognised rather 'Synizesis'—viz. the slurring of vowels together without complete loss of any sound—

* *Homerische Studien*, iii. pp. 7 ff.

than either Elision or Contraction. And this conclusion is supported by the general tendencies of the Ionic dialect, which was especially tolerant of hiatus, and allowed numerous combinations of vowels, such as *εα*, *εο*, *εω*, *εοι*, to have the value either of one syllable or two.*

382.] Hiatus after short syllables. The vowels which are not liable to elision may generally stand before hiatus: thus we find *ζωστῆρι ἀρηρότι* (§ 376, 3), *πρὸ ὁδοῦ*, *πρὸ Ἀχαιῶν*, *αὐτὰρ ὁ ἐμμεμαώς*, *ἐτάροιο ἐνηέος*, and the like.

Hiatus is also tolerated occasionally in the pauses of the verse:

(1) In the trochaic caesura of the third foot: as—

Il. 1. 569 *καὶ ῥ' ἀκέουσα καθῆστο, ἐπιγνάμψασα κτλ.*

Od. 3. 175 *τέμνειν, ὄφρα τάχιστα ὑπὲκ κτλ.*

(2) In the Bucolic diaeresis: as—

Il. 8. 66 *ὄφρα μὲν ἥως ἦν καὶ ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἡμαρ.*

Od. 2. 57 *εἰλαπινάζουσιν πίνουσί τε αἶθοπα οἶνον.*

The vowel of the Person-endings *-το*, *-ντο* seems to be especially capable of standing before hiatus in these places. It appears in more than a fourth of the whole number of instances given by Knös (pp. 42–45).

Hiatus in the Bucolic diaeresis is commoner in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*, in the proportion 2 : 1. Hiatus after the vowel *ε* is also comparatively rare in the *Iliad*: Knös reckons 22 instances (many of them doubtful), against 40 in the *Odyssey*. It is worth notice that in both these points books xxiii and xxiv of the *Iliad* agree with the *Odyssey*, also that book xxiv of the *Odyssey* contains an unusual number of instances of hiatus, both legitimate (Il. 63, 215, 328, 374, 466) and illegitimate (Il. 209, 351, 430).

Illegitimate hiatus, like other anomalies, may be diminished by emendation. Thus in Od. 5. 135 *ἡδὲ ἔφασκον* we may read *ἡδέ εἴ' ἔφασκον*: in 5. 257 *ἐπιχεύατο ὕλην* we may insert *ἄρ'*, on the model of Il. 5. 748 *ἐπεμάλει' ἄρ' ἱππους*. But in Il. 13. 22 *ἄφθιτα αἰεὶ* must stand because *ἄφθιτος αἰεὶ* is a fixed phrase. It is unlikely, then, that Hiatus was ever absolutely forbidden in Epic verse.

Doubtful Syllables.

383.] Besides the cases in which the metrical value of a syllable may be made uncertain by its place in a particular verse—i. e. by the circumstances of Position, Hiatus, Ictus, &c.—there are many instances in which the ‘natural’ quantity of the vowel appears to be indeterminate.

* The use of *εο* for *ευ* in Ionic inscriptions shows, not indeed that *ευ* and *εο* were identical in pronunciation, or that *εο* was a true diphthong, but certainly that *εο* was very like *ευ*, and might be monosyllabic in *scansion*. Probably monosyllabic *εο* (when it was not a mere error for *ευ*) stood to *ευ* as the Synizesis *εα*, *εω*, *εοι*, &c. to the contracted *η*, *ω*, *οι*. See Erman in *Curt. Stud.* v. 292 ff.

Under the heading of 'doubtful vowels' should be classed, not only the words in which the same letter may stand either for a long or a short vowel, as Ἄρης, ἀνὴρ, but also those in which the change is shown by the spelling, *i.e.* in which a short vowel interchanges with a long vowel or diphthong: as νεός and νηός, ὄνομα and οὖνομα, &c. And with these variations, again, we may place, as at least kindred phenomena, the doubtful syllables which arise from the interchange of single and double consonants: Ὀδυσσεύς and Ὀδυσεύς, Ἀχιλλεύς and Ἀχιλεύς. As we speak of doubtful vowels, these might similarly be called 'doubtful consonants.'

In all such words the variation of quantity may either mean that there were two distinct forms between which the poet had a choice, or that the quantity as it existed in the spoken language was in fact intermediate. The former case would usually arise when a vowel or syllable which had come to be short in the spoken language was allowed to retain its older quantity as a poetical archaism. In the latter case the poet could give the syllable either metrical value; or (as in so many instances) he might treat the syllable as ordinarily short, but capable of being lengthened by the *ictus*, or by the pauses of the verse.

384.] Doubtful vowels appear to rise chiefly in two ways:—

(1) By the shortening of a long vowel or diphthong before a vowel: viz.—

ā, in Ἰλαος (ā in Il. 1. 583, ä in Il. 9. 639., 19. 178).

η, in the oblique cases of νηῦς (except the Dat. νηϊ) and of several Nouns in -εύς, as Πηλῆος, Πηλέος: the forms ἦται and ἔται (ἦμαι): ἀφήη and ἀφέη (§ 80); ἦς and ἐς, ληϊστοί and λείστη (Il. 9. 408); perhaps also in Θρήϊκες, δῆϊος, ἦϊα, which shorten η when the case-ending is naturally long (Θρηϊκων, δητων, ἦτων, &c. scanned υ υ —, unless we suppose contraction or synizesis).

ι, in ἱερός, κονίη, λίην: Comparatives in -ων: Patronymics, as Κρονίων: ἴομεν, ἴημι (ἀφίει, &c.), λαίνω, and Verbs in -ιω, as τλώ, δίω (§ 51, 1): probably also in the abstract Nouns in -ιη, the ι being treated as long in ὑπεροπλίη, προθυμίη, ὑποδεξίη, ἀτυμίη, ἀκομιστίη.

υ, in Verbs in -υω (§ 51, 4).

ω, in ἥρωος (— υ υ in Od. 6. 303): ἥρω, *leg.* ἥρωϊ (Il. 7. 453).

αι, in αἰεί for αἰεί, ἔμπαϊος (— υ υ in Od. 20. 379), and the Compound χαμαιεῦναι, χαμαιεννάδες: also Verbs in -αιω, as ἀγαιόμενος and ἀγάασθε, κέραιε and κεράασθε, ναῖον and νάει, νάουσι.

ει, in ὠκέα, βαθέης (for ὠκεῖα, βαθειής): Adjectives in -ειος, as χάλκειος and χάλκεος: ρεία and ρέα: πλείον, &c. and πλέονες: βείομαι and βέομαι (§ 80), and many Verbs in -εω (§ 51, 3).

οι, in δλοός and δλοιός; also οίος (υ υ), as in Il. 13. 275 οἷδ' ἀρετὴν οἷός ἐσσι, cp. Il. 18. 105, Od. 7. 312., 20. 89.

ευ, in δεύομαι and δέομαι, ἔχευα and ἔχεα, ἡλεύατο and ἀλέασθαι.

υι, in υίός (Il. 4. 473., 5. 612, &c.).

The Gen. endings -ᾶων, -εων fall under this head, if -εων represents an older Ionic -ηων.

In some cases of this kind our texts have ει where it is probable that the original vowel was η: so in πλείος *full* (Attic πλέως from πλήος), χρεῖος *debt* and χρεῖω *need* (from χρη-, χρᾶ-). See Appendix C.

Sometimes ει has taken the place of ευ before another vowel, as in the Verbs θέω, πνέω, πλέω, χέω, κλέω (§ 29, 3); also in λείουσι, Dat. Plur. of λέων (λεῶν or λέων), and perhaps in the Pf. εἴωθα (cp. εὐέθωκε Hesych.), εἰοικνύαι (Il. 18. 418). Similarly ᾱ may stand for αυ, as φάεα *eyes* (φαν-), ἄήρ (cp. αὔρα) and other derivatives of ἄφημι (ἀλιᾶής, ἀκρ-ᾱής), ἀέσαμεν *we slept* (ιαύω), ἀασάμην (ἀφάτη), and probably μεμαῖότες, αἶον, αἰίδω, *Αἶδος. We even find οι for ου (from of), in οἰετέας for δ-φετέας *of like age* (Il. 2. 765), πνοιή for πνοφή: cp. οἶες (- υ υ in Od. 9. 425).

η for ευ may perhaps be seen in ἡείδης, ἡείδει (ἐ-φείδεας, -εε): but see the explanation suggested in § 67, 3.

Interchange of quantity is occasionally found: στέωμεν, κτέωμεν, φθέωμεν for στήομεν, &c. (§ 80): ἔως and τέως (if these forms are Homeric) for ἦος and τῆος. So the Gen. ending -εω, for -ᾶο (-ηο).

(2) By compensatory lengthening, of—

ε to ει, in ξείνος (ξένFος) but ξενίη, κεινός and κενός, πείραρ and πέρας (ἀπειρέσιος), εἵματος, εἵνεκα.

ο to ου, μούνος (but μονωθείς Il. 11. 470); οὔρος (*a watcher*) but ὀρ-άω: οὔρεα and ὄρος (ὀρFος?).

ᾱ in παρέχη (παρ-σέχω), Od. 19. 113; ῥ in συνεχές, Il. 12. 26.

Under this head we should place double forms arising by Epenthesis, as ἔταρος and ἑταῖρος (for ἑταρ-μος): ἐνί, ἐν and εἰν. But ἀπερείσιος *boundless* should be ἀπερήσιος, from *πέρη (πέρην).

Other variations, of which no general account can be given, are seen in *Ἀρης, ἀνήρ, ἀμάω *I reap* (ᾱ generally in the simple Verb, ᾱ in the compounds); φίλος (ι in φίλε κασίγνητε); ἄτιτος and τίτός; ὕδωρ, ἀντικρύ; δύο and δύω, δεῦρο and (once) δεύρω, Διόνυσος and Διώνυσος. The chief cases of a doubtful vowel

being long without the help of the ictus are, ἀρή, ἀλῶναι (ἀλόντε with \bar{a} in Il. 5. 487), πρίν, ἱμάς, πιφαύσκω.

385.] **Double consonants**, causing doubtful syllables: chiefly— $\sigma\sigma$, in the First Aorist (§ 39, 1), and Dat. Plur. (§ 102); also $\delta\sigma\sigma\sigma$, μέσσος, νεμεσσάω (where $\sigma\sigma = \tau\tau$), Ὀδυσσεύς. So for ἴσασι (— — —) we should write ἴσσασι (for ἴδ-σασι, § 7, 3).

λλ, in Ἀχιλλεύς.

κκ, in πελέκκῳ (κκ = κF?), cp. πέλεκυς.

As to ππ and ττ, in ὄππως, ὅττι, &c. see § 108, 2.

386.] **Metrical licence.** In a few cases the use of a vowel as long appears to be merely due to the necessities of the metre. Such are:—

α in ἀθάνατος, ἀκάματος, ἀπονέεσθαι, ἀποδίδωμαι, ἀγοράσθε.

ϵ in ἐπίτονος (Od. 12. 423), ζεφυρίη (Od. 7. 119).

ι in Πριαμίδης, διὰ (in διὰ μὲν ἀσπίδος κτλ. Il. 3. 357, &c.).

υ in θυγάτηρ (Il. 2. 492, &c.), δυναμένοιο (Od. 1. 276, &c.).

In these cases there is every reason to believe that the vowel was naturally short, and the lengthening must therefore be regarded as a necessary *licence*, to be compared with the neglect of Position before Σκάμανδρος, &c. (§ 370), or the synizesis of Αἰγυπτίη and Ἰστιάια (§ 378 *fin.*). The diphthong of εἰαρινός (ἐαρ), εἰρεσίη, οὐλόμενος, οὔνομα, Οὐλύμποιο, is of the same nature. The υ of πουλὺς perhaps began in compounds in which it was required by the metre, as πουλυβότειρα, &c., and was extended to the simple word. It is apparently a poetical form only (but see H. W. Smyth, *Vowel System*, p. 98).

Similarly a short vowel between two long syllables is sometimes treated as long: as in ἡγάασθε (Od. 5. 122), Ἡρακλείη (properly -κλειεῖη), Οἰκλείης (Od. 15. 244). So τετράκυκλος is scanned — — — — — in Od. 9. 242, but — — — — — in Il. 24. 324.

Vocatives.

387.] The short final syllable of the Vocative appears in several places as a metrically long syllable: as—

Il. 4. 155 φίλε κασίγνητε, θάνατον κτλ. and so 5. 359: also

Il. 19. 400 Ξάνθε τε καὶ Βάλιε, 21. 474 νηπύτιε,

Od. 3. 230 Τηλέμαχε.

4. 338 ὦ νῖξ Πετewώ κτλ.

18. 385 ὄρσο Θέτι τανύπεπλε: so Od. 24. 192 Λαέρταο πάϊ.

14. 357 Ποσειδάων ἐπάμυνε: so Il. 24. 569., Od. 8. 408, &c.

23. 493 Αἴαν Ἰδομενεῦ τε.

The reason may be found (as Hartel thinks*) in the nature of the Vocative as an interruption of the natural flow of a sentence. It is very possible, however, that the Nominative ought to be read in these places : see § 164.

The Digamma.

388.] In seeking to arrive at general conclusions as to the rules and structure of the Homeric hexameter, it was necessary to leave out of sight all the words whose metrical form is uncertain on account of the possible or probable loss of an initial consonant. It is time to return to this disturbing element of the enquiry.

The scholars who first wrote on this subject had few materials for their investigations outside of the Homeric poems. To them, therefore, the 'Digamma' was little more than a symbol—the unknown cause of a series of metrical anomalies. In the present state of etymological knowledge the order of the enquiry has been to a great extent reversed. It is known in most cases which of the original sounds of the Indo-European languages have been lost in Greek, and where in each word the loss has taken place. Hence we now come to Homer with this knowledge already in our possession. Instead of asking what sounds are wanting, we have only to ask whether certain sounds, of whose former existence we have no doubt, were still living at the time when the poems were composed, and how far they can be traced in their effect on the versification.

389.] **Nature of the evidence from metre.** The questions which are suggested by the discovery in Homer of traces of a lost 'Digamma' cannot be answered without some reference to the very exceptional circumstances of the text.

Whatever may be the date at which writing was first used in Greece for literary purposes, there can be no doubt that the Homeric poems were chiefly known for some centuries through the medium of oral recitation, and that it was not till the time of the Alexandrian grammarians that adequate materials were brought together for the study and correction of the text. Accordingly when these scholars began to collect and compare the manuscripts of Homer, they found themselves engaged in a problem of great complexity. The various readings, to judge from the brief notices of them preserved in the *Scholía*, were very numerous; and they are often of a kind which must be attributed to failure of memory, or the licence of oral recitation, rather than to errors of transcription. And the amount of

* *Homerische Studien*, i. p. 64.

interpolation must have been considerable, if there was any ground for the suspicions so often expressed by the ancient critics.

It follows from these circumstances that an attempt to restore the lost *F* throughout the text of Homer cannot be expected to succeed. Such an attempt necessarily proceeds on the assumption that the text which we have is sound as far as it goes, or that it is so nearly right that we can recover the original by conjecture. With an imperfect text the process can only be approximate. We may be satisfied if the proportion of failure is not greater than the history of the text would lead us to expect.

The loss of the *F*-sound, moreover, must have been itself a cause of textual corruption. It led to irregularities of metre, especially to frequent hiatus, and there would be a constant tendency to cure these defects by some slight change. The insertion of the *ν* ἐφελκυστικόν was almost a matter of course (see however § 391). The numerous alternative forms used in the poetical language, and the abundance of short Particles such as γε, τε, ῥα, &c. made it easy to disguise the loss of *F* in many places. We cannot be surprised, therefore, if we have often to make the reverse changes.

A few instances will serve to show the existence in pre-Alexandrian times of corruption arising from the tendency to repair defects of metre.

In Il. 9. 73 the MSS. have πολέεσσι δ' ἀνάσσεις, Aristarchus read πολέσιν γὰρ ἀνάσσεις. Both are evidently derived from πολέσιν δὲ ἀνάσσεις (*i. e.* *Φανάσσεις*), corrected in two different ways.

In Il. 13. 107 the MSS. have νῦν δ' ἔκαθεν, the reading of Aristarchus: but Zenodotus and Aristophanes had νῦν δὲ ἔκας (*i. e.* *Φέκας*).

In Il. 9. 88 the reading of Aristarchus was τίθεντο δὲ δόρπα ἕκαστος: other ancient sources had δόρπον (the reading of most MSS.).

In Il. 14. 235 πείθει, ἐγὼ δὲ κέ τοι εἰδέω χάριν ἡματα πάντα, the order χάριν εἰδέω was preferred by Aristarchus.

Two very similar instances are—

Il. 5. 787 κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, εἶδος ἀγητοί (*Ar.* ἐλεγχέες).

9. 128 γυναῖκας ἀμύμονα ἔργα ἰδυίας (*Ar.* ἀμύμονας).

In Od. 5. 34 ἡματί κ' εἰκοστῷ . . ἵκοιτο the 'common' texts of Alexandrian times (αἱ κοινότεραι) omitted the κ', which is not necessary, and may have been inserted in imitation of ἡματί κε τριτάτῳ κτλ. (Il. 9. 363).

In Od. 1. 110 οἱ μὲν ἄρ' οἶνον ἔμισγον some MSS. omit ἄρ'. So in Od. 3. 472 most MSS. have οἶνον οἰνοχοεῦντες (*vulg.* ἐνοινοχ.).

In Od. 2. 331., 8. 174., 13. 125 the ε of αἶρε is elided before a word with *F*. But in each case there is MS. authority for reading αἶ.

In Od. 8. 526 the MSS. are divided between ἀσπαίροντ' ἐσιδοῦσα and ἀσπαίροντα ἰδοῦσα.

It should be observed that the argument from these instances is equally good, whether the readings ascribed to Zenodotus, Aristarchus, &c. are conjectures made by them, or were derived (as is more probable) from older sources. They equally serve to illustrate the process by which traces of an

original *F* were liable to be gradually effaced. And it is not likely that there was any deliberate attempt to emend Homer on metrical grounds. It is enough to suppose that the metre helped to determine the preference given (consciously or unconsciously) to one or other of the existing variants.

390.] Words with initial *F*. The former existence of the *F* in a given Homeric word may be inferred either from its appearance in some other dialect of Greek, or (where this kind of evidence fails) from the corresponding forms in the cognate languages. Thus an original *Feíkōsi* is supported by the forms *Fíkari* and *Feíkari* on Doric and Boeotian inscriptions, by the Laconian *βείkari* (given by Hesychius), and again by Latin *viginti*, Sanscrit *vimcati*, &c.: an original *Féσπερος* by the form *Feσπapίwv* on a Locrian inscription, as well as by Latin *vesper*: original *Fδείv*, *Foída*, &c. by *Fίστοpes* on inscriptions, *γoída* and *γoίδημι* in Hesychius (erroneously so written, as Ahrens showed, for *Foída* and *Foίδημι*), and also by Latin *video*, Sanscrit *vedmi*, *veda*, Engl. *wit*, &c. We do not, however, propose to discuss the external evidence, as it may be called, by which the loss of an initial *F* is proved, but only to consider the degree and manner in which the former existence of such a letter can be shown to have affected the versification of Homer. For this purpose it will be enough to give a list of the chief words in question, and in a few cases a statement, by way of specimen, of some of the attempts made to restore the *F* to the text.*

ἀγνυμι.

The initial *F* is to be traced by the hiatus in Il. 5. 161 ἐξ αὐχένα ἄξῃ, Il. 8. 403 κατὰ θ' ἄρματα ἄξω (similar phrases in 8. 417., 23. 341, 467); less decisively by the lengthening of the final -*iv* of the preceding word in Il. 4. 214 πάλιν ἄγεν δζέες ὄγκοι. The evidence against an initial consonant is very slight. In Od. 19. 539 πᾶσι κατ' αὐχένας ἦξε we should read αὐχέν' ἔαξε (Bekk.), understanding the Singular distributively (§ 170). In Il. 23. 392 for ἔππειον δέ οἱ ἦξε may be read ἔππειόν οἱ ἔαξε.

* The first systematic attempt to restore the digamma was made by Heyne in his edition of the Iliad (1802). It was based upon Bentley's manuscript annotations, of which Heyne had the use. The first text with restored *F* was published by Payne Knight (1820). Much was done by the thorough and methodical *Quaestiones Homericae* of C. A. J. Hoffmann (Clausthal, 1842-48). The *F* was again printed in the text of Bekker's second edition (Bonn, 1858). The light of the comparative method was brought to bear upon it by Leskien (*Rationem quam I. Bekker in restituendo digammo secutus est examinavit Dr. A. Leskien*, Lipsiae, 1866). The most complete treatise on the subject is that of Knös (Upsaliae, 1872). The most important contributions, in addition to those mentioned, have been made by Leo Meyer (K. Z. xviii. 49), and by W. Hartel (*Hom. Stud.* iii). Most of the conjectures given in this chapter come from one or other of these sources.

ἄναξ (ἄνασσα, ἀνάσσειν).

The words of this group occur in Homer about 300 times, and in about 80 instances they are preceded by a final short vowel which would ordinarily be elided. This calculation does not include the phrase ἰφι ἀνάσσειν, or the numerous examples of hiatus after the Dat. Sing. in -ι and the Genitives in -οιο, -ειο, -ᾶο.*

The cases in which a slight correction of the text is needed to make room for the *F* are as follows:—

- Il. 1. 288 πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν (read πᾶσιν δέ).
- 9. 73 πολέεσσι δ' ἀνάσσεις (read πολέσιν δέ, § 389).
- 2. 672 Χαρόποιό τ' ἀνακτος (read Χαρόπου τε).
- 7. 162 (= 23. 288) πρῶτος μὲν ἀναξ (read perhaps πρῶτιστα).
- 15. 453 κροτέοντες ἀναξ (read κροτέοντε, the Dual).
- 16. 371 (= 507) λίπον ἄρματ' ἀνάκτων (read ἄρμα, § 170).
- 523 σύ πέρ μοι, ἀναξ, τόδε καρτερὸν ἔλκος ἄκεσσαι (read με).
- 23. 49 ὄτρυνον, ἀναξ (read ὄτρυνε, the Pres. Imper.).
- 517 ὅς ῥά τ' ἀνακτα (read ὅς τε or ὅς ῥα).
- Od. 9. 452 ἦ σύ γ' ἀνακτος (omit γ').
- 17. 189 χαλεπαὶ δέ τ' ἀνάκτων (omit τ').
- 21. 56 (= 83) τόξον ἀνακτος (read τόξα).

The Imperfect ἥνασσε, which occurs five times, can always be changed into ἔνασσε. The remaining passages are:—

- Il. 19. 124 σὸν γένος· οὐ οἱ ἀεὶ κῆς ἀνασσεμέν Ἀργεῖοισιν (a verse which is possibly interpolated).
- 20. 67 ἔναντα Ποσειδάωνος ἀνακτος (in the probably spurious θεομαχία).
- 24. 449, 452 ποιήσαν ἀνακτι.
- Od. 14. 40 ἀντιθέου γὰρ ἀνακτος κτλ.
- 395 εἰ μὲν κεν νοστήσῃ ἀναξ.
- 438 κύδαινε δὲ θυμὸν ἀνακτος.
- 24. 30 ἧς περ ἀνασσεσ.

ἄρνα (ἄρνες, &c.).

The *F* is supported by three instances of hiatus, viz. Il. 4. 158 αἰμά τε ἀρνῶν, 4. 435 ὅπα ἀρνῶν, 8. 131 ἦντε ἄρνες: and by the metrical length given to the preceding syllable in Il. 3. 103 ἐς δόλφρον ἄρνας, 16. 352 λύκοι ἄρνεσσι.

The passages which need correction are—

- Il. 3. 103 οἴσετε δ' ἄρν' (the δέ is better omitted).
- 119 ἦδ' ἄρν' ἐκέλευεν (read ἰδὲ ἄρν').
- 22. 263 οὐδὲ λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες (omit τε).
- Od. 4. 86 ἵνα τ' ἄρνες ἄφαρ κεραοὶ τελέθουσι (omit τ').
- 9. 226 ἐρίφους τε καὶ ἄρνας.

* For a complete analysis of the examples in the Iliad see Dawes, *Miscellanea Critica*, Sect. IV.

Note, however, that the evidence for *F* is confined to the Iliad, and that the derivative ἀρνείος shows no trace of it.

ἄστυ.

The presence of an initial consonant is shown by hiatus in nearly 80 places. In two places the text is uncertain: Il. 24. 320 ὑπὲρ ἄστεος (but διὰ ἄστεος in the Bankes papyrus, and several MSS.), Od. 3. 260 ἐκὰς ἄστεος (ἐκὰς Ἀργεος in most MSS.).

Two passages admit of the easiest correction:—

Il. 3. 140 ἀνδρὺς τε προτέρου καὶ ἄστεος (read προτέρου).

15. 455 τοὺς μὲν ὃ γ' Ἀστυνόμῳ (omit γε οἱ μὲν).

Two remain, viz.—

Il. 11. 733 ἀμφίσταντο δὴ ἄστυ (ἀμφέσταν Bekk.).

18. 274 νύκτα μὲν εἰν ἀγορῇ σθένος ἔξομεν ἄστυ δὲ πύργου (ἔξετε Bekk.).

The changes made by Bekker in these places are not improbable, but are hardly so obvious as to exclude other hypotheses.

ἔαρ, εἰαρινός.

Hiatus is found in Il. 8. 307 νοτίησί τε εἰαρινῇσι, and a short final syllable is lengthened in Od. 19. 519 ἀείδησιν ἔαρος. In the phrase ὥρη ἐν εἰαρινῇ we should doubtless omit the ἐν, as in Od. 5. 485 ὥρη χειμερῇ (Bentl.).

εἴκοσι.

The *F* appears in ἀνὰ εἴκοσι (Od. 9. 209), and the combination καὶ εἴκοσι (which occurs 9 times, including the compounds with δυωκαεικοσι-).

In Il. 11. 25 χρυσοῖο καὶ εἴκοσι read χρυσοῦ: and in the combination τε καὶ εἴκοσι (in three places) omit τε. In the recurring ἡλυθον εἰκοστῷ ἐτεί κτλ. Bekker reads ἡλυθον ἐεικοστῷ (Cobet well compares Od. 23. 102 ἔλθοι ἐεικοστῷ κτλ.). On Od. 5. 34 ἡματί κ' εἰκοστῷ κτλ. see § 389.

εἴκω.

Two instances of hiatus indicate *F*, in Il. 24. 100, 718, besides many places in which the word is preceded by a Dat. Sing., as οὐδένι εἴκων, κάρτεϊ εἴκων.

Two places may be easily corrected: Il. 4. 509 μῆδ' εἴκετε (read μὴ εἴκετε, with asyndeton, as Od. 24. 54 ἴσχεσθ' Ἀργεῖοι, μὴ φεύγετε), and 12. 48 τῇ τ' εἰκονσι (omit τε). In Od. 12. 117 for θεοῖσιν ὑπείξεαι read θεοῖς ὑποείξεαι (Bekk.) There remains Il. 1. 294 εἰ δὴ σοὶ πᾶν ἔργον ὑπέφομαι.

ἔοικα, ἔϊσκω, εἵκελος.

The *F* of ἔοικα appears from hiatus in 46 instances (not counting the numerous places in which it follows a Dative in -ι). The adverse instances are 11 in number, besides the form ἐπ-έοικε (which occurs 11 times). The corresponding Present εἵκω is generally recognised in Il. 18. 520 ὅθι σφίσιν εἵκε λοχῆσαι where it suited them to be in ambush. The form ἔϊσκω has hiatus before

it in 3 places, but twice rejects *F* (Od. 9. 321., 11. 363). The adjective *εἰκελος* or *ἱκελος* usually needs an initial consonant (except Il. 19. 282, Od. 11. 207).

It seems probable that this is the same word as *εἴκω* to yield. The notion of giving way easily passes into that of suiting or fitting, hence conforming to, resembling.

ἐκών, ἔκητι, ἔκηλος.

Hiatus indicating *F* is found in 22 places (not reckoning οὗ τι ἐκών Il. 8. 81, &c.).

In Od. 4. 649 for αὐτὸς ἐκὼν we may read αὐτὸς ἐγὼν (cp. Od. 2. 133, where both these forms are found in good MSS.). In Od. 17. 478 ἐσθι' ἔκηλος two MSS. have ἐσθ' (i. e. ἐσθε). The remaining exceptions are; with ἐκών, Il. 23. 434, 585, Od. 5. 100 (where we may read τίς κε, or perhaps τίς δὲ ἐκὼν . . διαδράμοι; the Opt. without ἄν being used as in negative Clauses, § 299 f): with ἔκηλος, Il. 8. 512, Od. 2. 311 (ἐὺφραίνεσθ' ἐκῆλον Bekk.).

ἐκάς, ἔκατος, &c.

Traces of *F* are to be seen in the hiatus νῦν δὲ ἐκάς (Il. 5. 791., 13. 107), ἀλλὰ ἐκάς (Od. 15. 33), οὐδὲ ἐκηβολίαι (Il. 5. 54): and in the lengthening in Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο (Il. 7. 83., 20. 295), εὐπλόκαμος Ἐκαμήδη, &c.

The exceptions are, Il. 1. 21, 438., 17. 333., 20. 422., 22. 15, 302, Od. 7. 321—mostly admitting of easy correction.

ἐκαστος.

The original *F* of this word (recently found on a Locrian inscription, see *Curt. Stud.* ii. 441 ff.) is traced by means of hiatus in 115 places. The adverse instances, however, are about 50 in number, and the proportion that can be removed by emendation is not so large as in most cases (see L. Meyer, *K. Z.* viii. 166. About a fourth of the exceptions appear in the recurring phrase μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστων).

The form ἐκάτερθε shows slight traces of initial *F* in Od. 6. 19 σταθμοῖν ἐκάτερθε, 11. 578 γῦπε δέ μιν ἐκάτερθε, 22. 181 τῷ δ' ἔσαν ἐκάτερθε. It is preceded by elision in Il. 20. 153 (omit β'), and in Il. 24. 273, Od. 7. 91 (omit δ').

εἶλω (ἔλσαι, ἐάλην), ἀλῶναι, ἄλις.

The *F* is shown by hiatus in Il. 1. 409 ἀμφ' ἄλα ἔλσαι: 16. 403 ἦστο ἀλείς (and five other examples of this Tense, viz. Il. 5. 823., 21. 571, 607., 22. 308, Od. 24. 538): Il. 18. 287 κεκόρησθε ἐέλμένοι: Il. 12. 172 ἦε ἀλῶναι (so 14. 81), Il. 21. 281 εἰμαρτο ἀλῶναι (so Od. 5. 312., 24. 34), Il. 81. 495 τῇ γε ἀλώμεναι. Before ἄλις hiatus occurs in about 12 places: cp. also Il. 23. 420 εἰνάτερες ἄλις ἦσαν.

In Il. 21. 236 κατ' αὐτὸν ἄλις ἔσαν some MSS. read ἔσαν ἄλις, and at l. 344 the same transposition may be made. The only other instance against *F* is Il. 17. 54 ὅθ' ἄλις ἀναβέβρυχεν (ἀναβέβροχεν Zenod.), where Bentley read δ' ἄλις ἀναβέβροχεν.

ἐλίσσω, εἰλύω.

Before ἐλίσσω hiatus is found in four places, and the recurring phrases καὶ ἔλικας βοῦς and εἰλίποδας ἔλικας βοῦς point in the same direction. The only exceptions are Od. 12. 355 βοσκέ-σκουθ' ἔλικες κτλ., and Il. 18. 401 γναμπτάς θ' ἔλικας.

It is probable that in many places the forms ἐλέλικτο, ἐλελίχθη, &c. are old errors for ἐφέλικτο, ἐφελίχθη, &c.: see Dawes, *Misc. Crit.* 177: also Heyne on Il. i. 530.

Traces of *F* in εἰλύω should perhaps be recognised in Od. 5. 403 (ἔρευρόμενον, εἰλυτο) and 15. 479 σάκεσιν εἰλυμένοι: cp. Il. 20. 492 φλόγα εἰλυφάξει. In Il. 18. 522 ἴζοντ' εἰλυμένοι it is easy to read ἴζον (as Bekker). The Aor. Part. ἐλυθείς has no *F*: but it may be from a different Verb-stem (see Buttm. *Lexil.* s. v. εἰλύω).

ἔλπω (ἔολπα).

The initial *F* of this word is proved by 10 instances of hiatus (including καὶ ἐλπίδος, Od. 16. 101., 19. 84). The Perfect ἔολπα also shows traces of *F* in the reduplicated syllable, viz. in Od. 2. 275., 3. 375., 5. 379.

In Il. 8. 526 εὐχομαι ἐλπόμενος should be εὐχομ' ἐελπόμενος (Hoffm.) or perhaps (as Zenodotus read) ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος. In four places *F*ἔλπω can be restored by very slight corrections:—

Il. 15. 701 Τρωσὶν δ' ἔλπετο (Τρωσὶ δέ Heyne).

18. 194 ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὅδ', ἔλπομ' (αὐτὸς ἐέλπομ' Heyne).

Od. 2. 91 (= 13. 380) πάντας μὲν ῥ' ἔλπει (omit ῥ').

Two others are less easy; Il. 15. 539 πολέμιζε μένων, ἔτι δ' ἔλπετο (μένων δ' ἔτι ἔλπετο Bentl.), and Il. 24. 491 ἐπὶ τ' ἔλπεται (καὶ ἔλπεται Bentl.).

The passages which tell against *F*έφολπα are Il. 20. 186 χαλεπῶς δέ σ' ἔολπα τὸ βρέειν (read σέ ἔολπα), 21. 583 μάλ' ἔολπας (μάλα ἔλπε' Hoffm.), 22. 216 νῶϊ γ' ἔολπα (omit γ'), Od. 8. 315., 24. 313.

ἔπος, εἰπεῖν.

The *F* of ἔπος is supported by about 26 instances of hiatus, and a much larger number in which preceding syllables are lengthened (as in the common line καὶ μιν ἀμειβόμενος ἔπεα κτλ.).

Of the apparent exceptions, about 35 are removed by reading ἔπεσσι for ἐπέεσσι (as in Il. 5. 40 χειρὸς ἐλοῦσ' ἐπέεσσι προσήδα, read ἐλοῦσα ἔπεσσι). This is justified by the fact that in similar words (esp. βέλος) the form in -εσσι is less frequent than that in -εσαι. A group of 11 may be corrected by scanning ἔπεα as a disyllable (υ-) in the formula φωνήσασα ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα. Another small group of exceptions is formed by phrases such as Od. 4. 706 ὁπὲρ δὲ δὴ μιν ἔπεσιν κτλ., where perhaps ἔ may be put for μιν. There remain two instances in the Iliad (5. 683., 7. 108), and seven in the Odyssey (11. 146, 561., 14. 509., 15. 375., 16. 469., 17. 374., 24. 161).

In εἰπεῖν the *F* is proved by about 80 instances of hiatus, besides lengthening such as we have in the forms ὦδε δέ τις εἶπεσκε, ὡς ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι, &c. The exceptions number about 35.

Of these exceptions 10 are found in the recurring line *ὄφρ' εἶπω τὰ με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει*. It has been suggested as possible that εἶπω has here taken the place of an older *ἔπω* (*φέπω*), or *ἔσπω* (cp. *ἔσπετε*). This supposition would of course explain other instances of neglected *F*, as Il. 1. 64., 11. 791, Od. 1. 10, 37, &c.

ἔρδω, ἔργον, &c.

The Verb *ἔρδω* is preceded by hiatus in two clear instances, Il. 14. 261, Od. 15. 360. In Il. 9. 540 *πόλλ' ἔρδεσκεν* there is an ancient *v. l.* *ἔρρεξεν*. In Il. 10. 503 *ὅτι κύντατον ἔρδοι* we may read *κύντατα*. But there are several instances on the other side in the Odyssey (viz. 1. 293., 5. 342, 360., 6. 258., 7. 202., 8. 490., 11. 80).

The reduplicated form *ἔοργα* (for *φέοργα*) is preceded by hiatus in 7 places. Instances on the other side are, Il. 3. 351 *ὃ με πρότερος κάκ' ἔοργε* (where the Aor. *ἔρεξεν* is more Homeric, cp. § 28), 21. 399 *ὅσσα μ' ἔοργας* (*ὅσσα ἔοργας* Ambr.), 22. 347 *οἶά μ' ἔοργας* (here also *με* may be omitted), Od. 22. 318 *οὐδὲν ἔοργώς* (read *οὐ τι*, cp. § 356).

The Noun *ἔργον*, with its derivative *ἐργάζομαι*, occurs in Homer about 250 times, and the *F* is required to prevent hiatus in about 165 places. There are about 18 instances against *F*.

εἶρω, ἐρέω.

The *F* of *εἶρω* is required by hiatus in the three places where it occurs, viz. Od. 2. 162., 11. 137., 13. 7; that of *ἐρέω* by about 50 instances of lengthening (such as *ἀλλ' ἔκ τοι ἐρέω, ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει*, and the like), against which are to be set three instances of elision (Il. 4. 176., 23. 787, Od. 12. 156).

ἐννυμι, εἶμα, ἐσθής.

The *F* is shown by hiatus in more than 80 places, including the instances of the Perfect Mid. (*εἶμαι, ἔσσαι, &c.*, see § 23, 5). The contrary instances are of no weight. The superfluous *ρ'* may be omitted in *ἐπεί ρ' ἔσσαντο* (three places), and *τ'* similarly in Od. 14. 510., 24. 67. This leaves Il. 3. 57, Od. 6. 83., 7. 259.

ἐμέω.

The *F* (which is inferred from Lat. *vomo*) may be restored by reading *ἐφέμεσσε* for *ἀπέμεσσε* (Il. 14. 437) and *αἶμα φεμέων*, or possibly *φέμων* (L. Meyer), for *αἶμ' ἐμέων* (Il. 15. 11).

ἔσπερος.

Hiatus occurs in six places, after the Prepositions *πоти* (Od. 17. 191) and *ἐπί*. There are no instances against *F*.

ἔτος.

The *F* is supported by the lengthening of the preceding syllable in five places, such as Il. 24. 765 *ἐεικοστὸν ἔτος ἐστί*.

In the only adverse instance, Il. 2. 328 τοσσαῦτ' ἔτεα, we may read and scan τοσσαῦτα ἔτεα, as in the case of ἔπεα (*supra*).

ιάχω, ἰαχή, ἡχή.

The *F* in ἰάχω and ἰαχή is chiefly indicated by 23 instances of a peculiar hiatus, viz. after a naturally short final vowel in arsis; as ἡ δὲ μέγα ἰάχουσα, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἰάχοντες, γένητο ἰαχή, and the like. There are 3 instances of lengthening by Position. The *F* is also proved by ἀῖαχος (= ἀ-ῖαχος) *without a cry*. The exceptions are confined to the Aor. or Impf. ἰαχον (ι), which never admits *F* in Homer: see § 31, 1, *note*.

The derivative ἡχέεις follows hiatus in two places (Il. 1. 157, Od. 4. 72): elsewhere in Homer ἡχή only occurs at the beginning of the line. The compound δυσ-ηγής (πολέμοιο δυσηγέος, Il. 2. 886, &c.) is best derived from ἄχος (see Wackernagel, *Dehnungsgesetz*, p. 42).

ιδεῖν, οἶδα, εἶδος.

In the different forms of the Second Aor. ιδεῖν the *F* is shown by upwards of 180 instances of hiatus, and about 12 instances of lengthening of a short syllable. The Indicative (εἶδον in Attic) is nearly always a trisyllable (*i. e.* ἔφιδον) in Homer. On the other side we have to set nearly 50 instances of neglected *F*, about half of which are susceptible of easy emendation (such as putting ιδεῖν for ιδέειν, omitting superfluous δέ, and the like).

In the Perfect οἶδα there are about 125 instances of hiatus, against 24 which need emendation. Of these, however, only about seven or eight present any difficulty. The proportion is much the same with the other forms, as εἶδομαι, εἴσομαι, &c., and the Nouns εἶδος (11 instances of hiatus, two adverse), ἰστωρ, ἰδρεῖη, εἶδωλον, &c.

ἰον (ἰόεις, ἰοδνεφές).

The *F* is supported by hiatus in Od. 4. 135., 9. 426, and is nowhere inadmissible.

ἰς, ἰφι (ἰφια), ἱες.

These words, with the derived proper names Ἰφιάνασσα, Ἰφίτρος, &c., show *F* in about 27 places, while seven or eight places need slight emendation. ἰφθιμος, which shows no trace of *F*, is probably from a different root.

ἰσος.

The *F* is traced in about 30 instances of hiatus; the adverse passages being 8 or 9 in number. In three of these, containing the phrase ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἰσῆς (Il. 11. 705, Od. 9. 42, 549) the form ἰσῆς should perhaps be changed to αἰσῆς *share*. Or we may recognise the Æolic form of the word, viz. ἴσσα (Fick, *Odyssæe*, p. 20). The other places are easily corrected.

ἴrus, ἰρέη.

The *F* is shown by hiatus (Il. 4. 486, Od. 10. 510). The Particle *τε* may be left out before *καὶ ἰρέαι* in Il. 21. 350.

οἶκος.

The *F* is required in 105 places by hiatus, in 14 by the lengthening of a short syllable. About 25 places are adverse.

οἶνος.

The *F* is required by hiatus in nearly 100 places. The adverse places are about 20 (including the names *Οἶνεύς* and *Οἶνόμαος*).

391.] Words with initial σ*F* ('*F*). Since the change of initial *σ* into the rough breathing must have been much earlier than the loss of *F*, it may be presumed that words which originally began with *σ*F** were pronounced at one time with the sound '*F*' (= our *wh*). The following are the chief examples in Homer:—

ἔο, οἶ, ἔ, ὄς, &c.

The *F* is proved by hiatus in upwards of 600 instances, by lengthening of a preceding short syllable in 136 instances. There are also about 27 places in which a short vowel in arsis is lengthened before it: as ἀπὸ ἔο, προτὶ οἶ (υ — —), θυγατέρα ἦν, πατέρι ᾤ, &c. About 43 places do not admit *F* without some change; of these 30 are instances of the Possessive ὄς.

This Pronoun is noticeable as the only word in which the original *F* is recognised in the spelling of our texts. The moveable -ν is not used before the forms οἶ, ἔ: thus we have δαῖτέ οἶ, ὥς κέ οἶ, &c.; and, similarly, οὗ οἶ, οὐ ἔθεν (not οὐχ οἶ, οὐχ ἔθεν). This rule is observed not only in Homer but also in the later Elegiac and Lyric poets, and even the lyrical parts of Tragedy (Soph. El. 195, Trach. 650). It does not apply, however, to the forms of the Possessive ὄς.

When the forms '*F*ε, '*F*οι suffer elision (§ 376), the word is reduced to '*F*' and consequently disappears from our texts. Thus in Il. 24. 154 ὃς ἄξει κτλ. it is plain from the parallel l. 183 ὃς σ' ἄξει that the original was ὃς '*F*' ἄξει (Bekker, *Hom. Bl.* i. 318). Other corrections of the kind are:—

Il. 1. 195 πρὸ γὰρ ἦκε, read πρὸ δέ '*F*,' as in l. 208 πρὸ δέ μ' ἦκε.

4. 315 ὥς ὀφελέν τις ἀνδρῶν ἄλλος ἔχειν, read ὥς '*F*.'

16. 545 μὴ ἀπὸ τεύχε' ἔλονται, read μὴ '*F*' (Cobet, *Misc. Crit.* 265).

Od. 5. 135 ἦδ' ἔφασκον θήσειν ἀθάνατον, read ἦδ' '*F*.'

Examples of the restoration of '*F*(οι) will be found in § 376.*

* The whole subject is fully treated by J. van Leeuwen, *Mnemos.* xiii. 188 ff. from whom these emendations are taken.

ἀνδάνω, ἡδύς, ἦδος.

The *F* appears in 12 or 15 instances of hiatus, and in the 2 Aor. form εὔαδε (for ἐFαδε). The exceptions are, Il. 3. 173 ὥς ὄφελεν θάνατός μοι ἄδειν (read ὥς μ' ὄφελεν θάνατος ἄδέειν, see § 365) and 6 places with ἡδύς, two of which (Il. 4. 131, Od. 19. 510) may be easily emended. The Substantive ἦδος occurs chiefly in the phrase ἔσσεται ἦδος, where ἔσται may perhaps be read.

ἔθος, ἦθος.

The *F* is indicated by the hiatus κατὰ ἦθεα (Od. 14. 411). In μετὰ τ' ἦθεα καὶ νομόν ἵππων (Il. 6. 511., 15. 268) the τε is better omitted. The Pf. εἴωθα or ἔωθα probably had no initial *F*, since σF- would give in reduplication σσεσF- or ἔσF- (not σφεσF-).

ἐκυρός.

The only place bearing on the question before us is Il. 3. 172 φίλε ἐκυρέ, where the metre points to an initial consonant.

ἔξ.

The *F* may be traced by hiatus in Il. 5. 270 τῶν οἱ ἐξ κτλ., by lengthening in Il. 24. 604, Od. 10. 6. Adverse instances are Il. 23. 741, Od. 3. 115, 415., 14. 20.

ἔτης.

The *F* appears from hiatus in seven places, and can always be restored. The word is probably formed from the pronominal stem σFe- (so that it is = *unus e suis*).

392.] *F* inferred from metre. A few words may be added here which in all probability had initial *F*, though the traces of it in the metre are not supported by independent evidence.

ἀραιός.

The hiatus in three places indicates the loss of a consonant.

ἔθνος (perhaps akin to ἔθος, ἦθος).

Hiatus precedes in 12 places, and there is only one instance on the other side, viz. Il. 11. 724 τὰ δ' ἐπέρρεον ἔθνεα πεζῶν (where ἐπέρρεε is better, see § 172).

ἐρύω, ἔρρω.

Hiatus is found before ἐρύω *to draw* in 14 places (not counting those which are indecisive, such as ξίφος ὃξ' ἐρυσσάμενος, or ἐπ' ἡπείροιο ἔρυσσαν), and preceding short syllables are lengthened in 17 places. There are 17 instances against *F*, one of the strongest being Il. 1. 141 νῆα μέλαιναν ἐρύσσομεν (= Od. 8. 34., 16. 348). The Verb ῥύομαι *to protect* is unconnected with ἐρύω.

The Verb ἔρρω (probably Lat. *verro*) shows hiatus in the phrase ἐνθάδε ἔρρων (Il. 8. 239., 9. 364); cp. ἀπό-ερσε, ἀπο-έρσειε.

ἦνοψ.

The word occurs six times (counting the proper name ἦνοψ), and except in one place (where it begins the line) always requires an initial consonant.

ἦρα.

In the phrase ἐπὶ ἦρα φέρειν : referred to the root *var* meaning to *choose* or *wish*.

ἡρίον.

The only instance of this word (Il. 23. 126 μέγα ἡρίον) is in favour of initial *F*.

ἔμαι.

An initial consonant is shown by hiatus in 23 places (ὁ δὲ ἔτο, οἴκαδε ἱεμένων, &c.): there are four adverse places, viz. Il. 18. 501, Od. 2. 327., 10. 246., 14. 142. It is not connected with ἱημι, but is to be referred to root *vī*, meaning to *aim at*, *wish* (L. Meyer, *Bezz. Beitr.* i. 301).

ἴλιος.

An initial consonant is indicated in about 50 places; the number of adverse instances is 14. The derivation of this important word is unknown.

ἴπος, ἴρις.

These words may be connected with εἶρω to *tell*. If so, the *F* of ἴρις is to be traced in ὠκέα ἴρις (19 times), ὧς ἔφαρ', ὥρο δὲ ἴρις (three times), βάσκ' ἴθι, ἴρι κτλ.; that of ἴπος, Od. 18. 73, 334 (but not always, see vv. 38, 56, 233).

393.] Loss of *F* in Homer. The chief instances in which loss of an original *F* can be shown to have taken place in the language of Homer fall under the following rule:—

When the original initial *F* is followed by the vowels *ο*, *ω*, or the diphthong *ου*, it produces no effect on the metre of Homer.

The following are words to which this rule will apply* :—

ὄρῳ, οὔρος (and οὐρεύς) a *watcher*; ὄρεσθαι to *watch*. The original *F* (Germ. *wahr*-) will account for the forms ἐδῶρον and ἐπὶ-οὔρος, but there are no traces in the *metre* of such forms as *Forῶ*, &c.

ὄρος *mountain* (cp. *Bopéas*), and ὀρθός *upright*, which may be from the same root (cp. the Laconian Ἀρεμὶς Βωρθία). There is only one instance of hiatus (viz. Od. 3. 290 ἴσα ὄρεσσιν).

ὄρυξ (Sanscr. *vartakas* a *quail*) appears in the name Ὀρυγίη, which does not admit *F* (Od. 5. 123).

* See an article by Leo Meyer, *K. Z.* xxiii. pp. 49 ff.

ῥος *chariot* (Lat. *veho*); *ῥλος* (lit. *movement, tossing*), *ῥλλέω* *to disturb* (cp. *ῥχλεύς* and Lat. *vectis*); *ῥχθέω* (Lat. *vehe-mens*). A trace of *F* appears in the form *συνεοχμός* (Il. 14. 465).

ῥψ, *ῥσσα*, *ῥμφή* *voice*. The traces of *F* are, one instance of hiatus before *ῥπα* (Od. 11. 421), two of lengthening of a short syllable (Il. 18. 222, Od. 12. 52), and one or two phrases such as *ῥμειβόμεναι ὀπὶ καλῇ*, &c.; while there are three undoubtedly adverse places (Il. 11. 137., 21. 98, Od. 5. 61). In the case of *ῥμφή* the evidence is clear against *F*; in *ῥσσα* it is indecisive.

οὔρανός (Sanscr. *varuṇas*).

οὔλαι *coarsely ground barley*, connected with the root *Fελ*-, meaning *to roll*, &c. Neither this word nor the derivative *οὔλοχύται* admits *F*.

οὔλαμός *crowd, press of battle*, shows traces of initial *F* in Il. 20. 379 *ἔδυσσετο οὔλαμόν ἀνδρῶν* and the phrase *ἀνὰ οὔλαμόν ἀνδρῶν* (Il. 4. 251, 273., 20. 113). It does not occur except in these places.

οὔτῳ, *ῥτελή* *wound*: cp. *ᾗ-ουτος* *unwounded*, and the form *γατάλαι* in Hesychius.

ῥθέω (*ῥώθεον*, *ῥωσα*), root *vadh* *to beat*.

ῥνος *price*, Impf. *ῥωνούμην* (Sanscr. *vasnas*, Lat. *vēnum*).

Other words which may have originally had initial *F* are, *ῥρκος* (cp. *ἐπί-ορκος*), *ῥνίνημι* (*ῥρι-οῦνιος*), *ῥγγνυμι* (*ᾗνα-οίγεσκον*, *ᾗνέωγε*, &c.), *ῥπνίω*, *ῥκνος*, *οὔρη*, &c. (L. Meyer, *l. c.*). However this may be, none of them show traces of *F* in Homer. There remain the forms of the Possessive *ῥς* to which the rule would apply, viz. *οὔ*, *ῥν*, *ῥ*, *ῥν*, *οὔς*. Hiatus is found before *ῥν* in 18 places (before *ῥνδε* *δόμονδε* seven times, *ῥν κατὰ θυμόν* six times, in *προτὶ ῥν* four times), *οὔς* twice (Il. 2. 832., 11. 330), *οὔ* once (Od. 15. 358). On the other hand there are 22 places in which the forms in question do not admit *F*. The significance of this proportion appears when we know that in the case of the remaining forms of the Possessive *ῥς* the places with hiatus number 50, the adverse instances 8, and that with the forms of the Personal Pronoun (*ῥο*, *οἶ*, &c.) the proportion is 728 to 19. It seems probable, therefore, that in the forms *οὔ*, *ῥν*, &c. the *F* was no longer pronounced, though *traces* of the former pronunciation remained (as in the case of *οὔλαμός* and *ῥψ*). Similarly in English the sound of *w* is lost before the vowel *o* in *who*, *whom*, *whose*, but retained in *which*, *what*, &c.

The retention of *F* before the diphthong *οι*, as in *οἶ*, *οἶο*, *οἶς*, also in *οἶκος* and *οἶνος*, may indicate that *ο* before *ι* had not its ordinary sound, but one approaching to *ε* (possibly like French *eu*). This agrees with the fact that *οι*

and *v* were afterwards identical in sound, and that in the modern language both are = *v*.

Words with initial *v* are not found in Homer with *f*; but we cannot in this case speak of the loss of *f*—the combination *fv* having been *originally* impossible.

The remaining instances in which loss of *f* may be assumed in Homeric words are few, and for the most part open to question.

ἔλκω, root *valk* or *vlak* (Knös, following Curtius): *f* is perhaps seen in κατὰ ὤλκα (Il. 13. 707., Od. 18. 375). This account of the word separates it from Lat. *sulcus*.

ἐλεῖν, ἔλωρ, possibly to be connected with Lat. *vultur* the bird of prey. The instances of hiatus before ἔλωρ are hardly enough to prove *f*.

ἔλος, from which the name Velia is said by Dionysius Hal. (*Arch.* 1. 20) to be derived, has no *f* in Homer (Il. 2. 584, 594., 20. 221, Od. 14. 474). The *f* of this word is also wanting in the Cyprian dialect (Deecke and Siegismund, *Curt. Stud.* vii. 249).

ἦλος, Ἡλείος is without *f* in Homer: φαλήϊοι is the form found on Elean and Laconian inscriptions.

ἦλος (Lat. *vallus*) rejects *f* in Il. 11. 29 ἐν δέ οἱ ἦλοι: the two other places where it occurs prove nothing.

ἰδῶ, ἰδρώς (root *svid*): the *σf* is lost in Homer.

ἵκω, ἱκνέομαι: the derivation from the root *vic* is quite uncertain.

ἱστίη (Lat. *Vesta*): the forms ἀν-έστιος, ἐφ-έστιος show that the *f* is lost in Homer (as also in the Laconian, Locrian, and Boeotian dialects, see § 404).

394.] Initial *δf*. This combination is to be recognised in two groups of words:—

δfei- (*δfi-*), ἔδεια (so Ar.), δέος, δεινός, δειλός, &c.

A short vowel is frequently lengthened before these words, as Il. 1. 515 οὐ τοι ἔπι δέος, Il. 11. 37 περὶ δὲ Δεῖμός τε Φόβος τε, Od. 5. 52 ὅς τε κατὰ δεινούς, Od. 9. 236 ἡμεῖς δὲ δέισαντες.

The cases in which a vowel is allowed to count as short before the *δ* of this root are extremely few: Il. 8. 133 βροντήσας δ' ἄρα δεινόν, Od. 12. 203 τῶν δ' ἄρα δεισάντων (read ἄρ); Il. 13. 165 ἀπὸ ἔο δεῖσε δέ. There remain only Il. 13. 278 ἐνθ' ὃ τε δειλὸς ἀνὴρ (read ἐνθ' ὅς τε δειλός), Il. 15. 626, and the forms ὑποδέσκατε (Od. 2. 66), δεδέασι (Il. 24. 663), ἀδεῖης (Il. 7. 117).

δῆν, δηρόν, δηθά.

In δῆν the *f* is required in the phrases οὐ τι μάλα δῆν, οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι δῆν, &c.; there are no contrary instances. In δηρόν it is traced in two places, Il. 9. 415 (ἐπὶ δηρόν δέ μοι αἰών), Od. 1. 203: but is more commonly absent (οὐκέτι δηρόν, &c.). The instances of δηθά do not show anything.

It is to be observed that except in ἔδεια the original *δf* does not lengthen a vowel without the ictus. Compare the rule as to initial *f* lengthening a short syllable by Position, § 391.

395.] Initial Fρ, &c. The metrical value of an initial ϕ which represents Fρ differs in the several words. It has always the effect of a double consonant in ῥήγνυμι, ῥίπτω, ῥάκος, ῥν- (in ῥυτός, &c.), ῥη- (in ῥητός, ῥητήρ), and nearly always in ῥωός (except Od. 5. 281), ῥίζα (Od. 9. 390). But lengthening is optional in ῥέζω, ῥιγέω, ῥεία: thus we have ῥρεξα and ῥρεξα (in 27 places); ῥιπποι δὲ ῥεία (Il. 8. 179), but ἔνθα κε ῥεία κτλ.; ῥρρίγησαν, but ὧς φάτο ῥίγησεν δὲ κτλ. As to ϕ- standing for an older σρ-, and the other letters (λ, μ, ν) which lengthen a preceding short vowel, see § 371.

396.] F not initial. The metrical tests by which initial F is discovered generally fail us when the sound occurs in the middle of a word. Loss of F may be shown either (1) by the contraction or synizesis of two vowels originally separated by it, or (2) by the shortening of the first of two such vowels. We have seen that the instances of contraction and synizesis are too rare or doubtful to prove much (§ 378*, 4). The cases in which hiatus is indicated by the shortening of a vowel are somewhat more important. In the declension of νῆς the forms νεός, νέες, νεών, νέεσσι, νέας (§ 94, 1) cannot be derived phonetically from νηφός, &c., unless we suppose loss of F to have taken place. The same applies to the double forms of Nouns in -εως, as Πηλῆος and Πηλέος, &c. Unless the short vowel is explained on some other hypothesis (e.g. by variation in the stem, as in Ζεύς and βούς, § 106, 2), we must suppose that F had ceased to be sounded in the middle of a word. The loss of F would also explain the metathesis of quantity in ἔως for ῆος in Od. 2. 79 (see § 171, 1), τέως for τῆος in Il. 19. 189 αὐθι τέως ἐπειγόμενος (where G. Hermann read αὐτοῦ τῆος), Il. 24. 658, Od. 18. 190: but this, as these instances show, is even rarer than synizesis in these words, and is almost certainly post-Homeric.

Compound Verbs usually recognize F, as ἀπο-ειπών, δια-ειπέμεν, also with apocope παρ-ειπών (ἀ), &c. Exceptions are: ἀπ-ειπέμεν (Od. 1. 91), ἀπ-ειπόντος (Il. 19. 75), δι-ειπε (Il. 10. 425), πᾶρ-είπη (Il. 1. 555): κατ-είρυσται (Od. 8. 151., 14. 332., 19. 289): ἐσ-ίδεσκε, ἐσ-ιδέσθην, ἐσ-ιδούσα, ἐκατ-ιδών, ἐπ-ιδόντα: ἐπ-έοικε (11 places): ὑπέϊχομαι (Il. 1. 294, Od. 12. 117). In some of these forms metrical necessity may be pleaded; thus ἐπι-φέβοικε and ἐπ-φέβοικε, κατα-φιδών and κατ-φιδών (-υ-) are alike impossible in the hexameter. Hence we may suppose a licence by which (as in the case of φρ, βρ, &c. § 370) the combinations νf, τf, πf, did not 'make Position.' The instances to which this excuse does not apply are very few.

On the other hand there are several examples of words in which F between two vowels, or between a vowel and a liquid (ρ or λ), is vocalised as υ; αὐλαχοι (ἄ-φίφαχοι), ἀτέρνον, ἀγανός, ταλαύρινος (ταλά-φρινος), εὐαδε, ἐχενα, ἀλεῦσθαι, δεύομαι, εὐληρα,

ἀπούρας (§ 13), ἀκουή. It is very possible that many more such forms were to be found in the original text: cp. § 384, 1.

397.] Loss of initial σ and ι (γ). The traces of these sounds in the metre of Homer are chiefly of interest for the purpose of comparison with the facts relating to *F*.

The effects of initial σ may be seen in a few cases of the non-elision of prepositions: ἐπι-άλλμενος (Lat. *salio*), ἀμφί-αλος (Lat. *sal*), ἀμφί-επον (Lat. *sequor*), κατα-ίσχηται (ίσχω for σίσχω), and the lengthening in πᾶρέχῃ (Od. 19. 113) and σὺνεχὲς (Od. 9. 74). Hiatus is also found twice before ἔλῃ (Il. 14. 285, Od. 5. 257), once before ἵππος (Od. 10. 68), and 18 times before ἐός (mostly in the principal caesura). These instances however are too few to prove anything.

Initial ι or γ is chiefly traced in the Adverb ὥς, which when used after the Noun to which it refers is allowed to lengthen the final syllable: as θεὸς ὥς, ὄρνιθες ὥς, &c. (so in 36 places). On the other hand there are nearly as many places which do not admit an initial consonant: as κτίλος ὥς (Il. 3. 196), λέονθ' ὥς (Il. 11. 383., 12. 293., 16. 756), θεὸς δ' ὥς κτλ. Probably therefore no spirant was heard, and the lengthening of the syllable before ὥς was a mere 'survival' or traditional rule (§ 375, 1).

398.] Summary. According to the computation of Prof. Hartel there are 3354 places in which the effect of the Digamma can be traced on the metre of Homer. In 2324 places its presence is shown by hiatus after a short vowel (*i.e.* it prevents elision); in 359 places it justifies the lengthening of a short syllable ending in a consonant, in other words, it helps to make 'Position'; in 164 places it follows a long vowel or diphthong which is without ictus: in 507 places it follows a long vowel or diphthong with ictus. It is further to be noticed that in many places a short final vowel in arsis is lengthened before the *F*: see especially the instances given under εὖ (§ 390), and ἰάχῃ (§ 389).* On the other hand there are 617 places where the *F* is neglected. Short vowels suffer Elision before it in 324 places: it fails to lengthen by Position after another consonant in 215 places: and long vowels or diphthongs are shortened before it in 78 places. Also the power to lengthen by Position is confined, except in the case of the enclitic εὖ, οἶ, to lengthening of syllables which have the ictus.

399.] Theories of the *F*. The main question which arises on these facts evidently is: How can the great number of passages

* A short vowel is also lengthened with ictus before ξπος (Od. 10. 246), ἐρξαν (Od. 14. 411), and in the Compounds ἀπο-ειπών (Il. 19. 35) and ἀπο-έρση, ἀπο-έρσειε (Il. 21. 283, 329).

in which the *F* affects the metre of Homer be reconciled with the not inconsiderable number of passages in which it is neglected?

The scholars who first became aware of the traces of a lost letter in Homer assumed that in the original form of the poems this letter, or at least the consonantal sound for which it afterwards stood, was consistently used—that it was in fact one of the ordinary sounds of the language—; and accordingly they directed their efforts to restoring it to the text. This was the principle on which Bentley made his famous series of emendations: and which was carried out by Bekker in his edition of 1858. Of late years, however, different views of the matter have been taken. Leskien seems to have been the first to maintain that the passages which do not admit *F* are not necessarily corrupt or spurious, but are to be regarded as evidence of an original fluctuation in the use of the sound. His view is adopted and defended by Curtius (*Grundz.* p. 560, 5th ed.). Prof. Hartel has more recently put forward a theory which agrees with that of Curtius in treating the apparent neglect of the *F* as part of the original condition of the text. But he ascribes this neglect, not to irregularity in the use of the sound, but to the intermediate half-vowel character of the sound itself.

400.] If we are not satisfied that the *F* had the value of an ordinary consonant at the time when the Homeric poems were produced (or when they received their present form), we may explain the influence which it has on the metre in several ways.

Hypothesis of alternative forms. We may suppose that each word that originally had initial *F* was known to Homeric times in two forms, an older form with the *F*—confined perhaps to the archaic or poetical style—and a later in which *F* was no longer heard. Just as the poet could say either *σὺς* or *ὕς*, either *πόλις* or *πίλις*, either *τελέσσαι* or *τελέσαι*, so he may have had the choice between *Ἰάναξ* and *ἄναξ*, *Ἰηδύς* and *ἦδύς*, &c.

In order to test the probability of this hypothesis, let us take a few common words of different metrical form, and which show no trace of *F*, the words *Ἄρης*, *ἄριστος*, *ἔγχος*, *ἡμαρ*, *δμιλος*, *ὀφθαλμός*, *ῥῥωρ*, *ῥπρος*. These words, with their immediate derivatives, occur in the *Iliad* 1022 times; and the places that would not admit an initial consonant number 684, or just two-thirds of the whole. Again, take some of the commonest words with *F*, *ἄναξ*, *ἄστυ*, *ἔργον*, *οἶκος*, and the Aorist *ἰδεῖν*. These occur in the *Iliad* 685 times, and the exceptions are hardly 50, or about one-fourteenth. Compared with the other proportion this surely proves that the recognition of the *F* in these words was not arbitrary, but was the rule in Homeric verse.

401.] **Explanation from fixed phrases, &c.** The traces of *F*

may also be ascribed to the conventional phrases of the early epic style. The word ἄστυ, for example, is found very frequently in the combinations ποτὶ ἄστυ, ἀνὰ ἄστυ, κατὰ ἄστυ, &c. ; but these do not prove the pronunciation *F*ἄστυ for Homeric times any more than (*e.g.*) ἐπιεικής proves an Attic ἐπι*F*εικής. Such phrases, it may be said, were handed on ready-made, with a fixed metrical value, and served as models for fresh combinations, in which the hiatus was retained as part of the familiar rhythm.

This explanation is inadequate, for the following reasons :—

(1) The instances of *F* are not confined to the commonest words, or to frequently recurring phrases. Thus it is found in *ἴον a violet*, *ἵπυς the fellow of a wheel*, *ἰτέη a willow*, *ἄπρες lambs*. And it is used (generally speaking) in all the different forms of each Verb or Noun, whether of common occurrence or not (*ἰδεῖν* as well as *ἰδέειν*, *ἴνεσι* as well as *ἴς* and *ἴφι*, &c.).

(2) The other cases in which tradition can be shown to have had the effect of retaining older phrases and combinations are not really parallel. In the Homeric Hymns the *F* can be clearly traced : but the proportion of instances which do not admit *F* is markedly different. Taking the words already used as examples, viz. *ἄναξ*, *ἄστυ*, *ἔργον*, *οἶκος*, *ἰδεῖν*, we find them in the Hymns 152 times, while the *F* is neglected in 36 places, or nearly one-fourth of the whole. Again if we look at the words which begin with *ο*, as *οὐλαμός*, *ὄψ*, &c. (§ 393), we find similar conditions. The traces of *F* are undoubted, but do not predominate as with *ἄναξ* or *ἄστυ*. Other examples may be seen in the traces of the double consonants, *σρ*, *σλ*, *σν*, *Fr* discussed in § 371. Compare the free use of alternate forms, as *ἔρεξα* and *ἔρρεξα*, *προ-ρέω* and *ἐπιρρέω*, with the almost invariable recognition of *δF* in *δέος*, *δείσας*, &c. We seem to be able to draw a broad distinction between the *predominating* influence of the *F* in Homer and the arbitrary or occasional influence of the older forms in other cases. And these other cases, we may conclude, give us a measure of the force of tradition in such matters, while in the case of the Homeric *F* the effect is due to its retention as a living sound.

(3) A further argument in favour of *F* as a real sound in Homer has been derived from the places in which **Fe*, **Foi* suffer elision (§ 391) ; see Leaf's note on Il. 24. 154. The argument has much force, and would be conclusive if we could assume that an elided vowel was not sounded at all.

402.] **Hiatus &c. as a survival.** Another supposition, akin to the last discussed, is that in the words which originally had initial *F* the ordinary effects of an initial consonant remained after the sound itself was no longer heard. Such a phenomenon would be by no means without parallel in language. In French,

for instance, elision is not allowed before certain words beginning with *h*, as *le héros*, *la hauteur*, though the *h* is no longer pronounced. Similarly, then, it may be held that the facts of Homeric metre only prove the habit or rule of treating certain words as if they began with *F*.

On the other side it may be urged that the *h* of *héros*, *hauteur*, &c. is only traced in one way, viz. by hiatus, and that only in a small number of combinations; whereas the *F* not only protects hiatus, but also makes Position. Moreover the retention of a traditional usage of this kind is very much easier in an age of education. Anomalies which would naturally disappear in a few years are kept alive by being taught to successive generations of children. It seems difficult to believe that the *F* would have kept its present place in the memory of the poets unless it were familiar, either to the ear as a present sound, or to the eye as a letter in the written text.

403.] Explanation from the nature of the *F*. The theory recently advanced by Prof. Hartel is one to which it is difficult to do justice in a short statement. The careful re-examination which he has made of the metrical facts has convinced him that the influence of the *F* is not occasional or arbitrary, but in the strictest sense universal in Homer. He does not however regard the passages in which the *F* appears to be neglected as corrupt or spurious, but explains them on the theory that the *F* in Homer has not the full value of an ordinary consonant: comparing it, for instance, not with the initial *V* of Latin, but with the sound which that letter has in the combination *QV*.

Hartel's chief argument is that hiatus after short vowels is the most common of the metrical facts pointing to a lost *F*, and especially that it is much commoner than lengthening by Position, the numbers being 2995 and 359 respectively. But the force of this argument depends in the case of each word on the metrical form: thus before a word of iambic form the syllable must be short, hence we may find hiatus, but not lengthening: before an anapaest the reverse holds good. If (using Hartel's list) we take the instances in which *F* is followed in the verse by two short syllables—the words being ἄγεν, ἄλις, ἔαρος, ἔλικες (with ἐλίκωπες, &c.), ἔπος, ἐρύω, ἔτος, ἰαχή, ἴδον—we shall find that they number 415, and the *F* makes Position in 98. But this is not materially different from the proportion which will be found to obtain in the case of any common word of the same metrical form (such as πόλεμος).

404.] *F* in other Greek dialects. It seems desirable here to say something of the uses of the Digamma which are found on the older inscriptions of the chief Doric and Æolic dialects.

The forms preserved on these inscriptions do not indeed prove anything directly as to the Homeric digamma. We cannot infer from them, for instance, that the symbol *F* was ever used in any written copies of the poems, or that the sound which it represented in other dialects was known to the Homeric language. But they may serve by way of analogy to direct our conjectures on these questions.

The most striking examples of *F* are found on the inscriptions of Corinth and its colony Corcyra (as *Φεκάβα*, *Φιόλαφος*, *Φίφιτος*, *ΔΦεινίλας*, *Αίφας*, *Ξένφων*, *Ξενφάρεος*, *ὄρφος*, *Τλασίαφο*, &c.). With these may be placed the Argive inscriptions (in one of which occurs *Διφι*), and the few Laconian inscriptions. In the older monuments of these dialects initial *F* is never wanting; but omission in the body of the word is occasionally found, as in *Δαίφοβος* and *Πολυξένα* (on the same Corinthian vase), and several names ending in *-κλής* (for *-κλέφης*), and *-λας* (for *-λαφος*). The scanty Phocian inscriptions yield the important forms *Φέξ*, *αίφεί*, *κλέφος*, with no early examples of omission; and the little known Pamphylian dialect is equally constant, so far as it has been made out. The Locrian dialect shows more decided indications of falling off in the use of the digamma. On the inscriptions of that dialect (discussed by Prof. Allen in *Curt. Stud.* iii. 207 ff.) we find it in *Φαστός*, *Φέκαστος*, *Φεκών*, *Φέτος*, *Φεσπάριος*, *Φοίκος* and its compounds (*ἐπιφοίκος*, &c.), also in *καταφέ*, *Φεφαδηκότα*: but not in *δαμιωργός*, *ξένος*, *έννέα*, *Ὀπώντιος* (for original *Ὀποφέντιος*). The only initial *F* which is wanting is in the word *ιστίαι* (we may compare the Laconian and Homeric *ἐφέστιος*). Similarly in the older Elean inscriptions initial *F* is regular (*Φάργον*, *Φέπος*, *Φράτρα*, &c.); and we have also *Ἐρφαοῖοι* (*people of Heraea*?), *ἐφέρεν* (prob. an Infinitive), but *ξένος*, *Διός* without *F*. In the great inscription of Gortyn initial *F* appears in *Φός* (*suus*), *Φίν* (= *Φοῖ*), *Φέκαστος*, *Φεκάτερος*, *Φέρξαι*, *Φεργασία*, *Φῆμα* (*είμα*), *Φείπαι*, *Φοικεύς*, *Φοῖνος*, *Φίκατι*, *Φεξήκοντα*, and is only lost in *ὦνά*, *ὦνάω* (before *ω*, § 393). The *F* is also found in Compounds, as *ένφοικῇ*, *προφειπάτω*, *δυοδεκαφετίες*, and in the body of the word *Φισφόμοιρος*, but disappears between vowels, as in *λάω* (Gen. of *λάος* a stone), *αίεί*, *παιδίων*, the oblique Cases of Nouns in *-υς* and *-εως* (*νίέες*, *Φοικέα*, *δρομέες*, &c.), and the contracted words *ἄτα* (*ἄτάτη*) and *ἄς* (for *ἄφος*, = *ἔως*). It is also lost before *ρ*, as in *ἀπορηθέντι*.*

A somewhat later stage in the use of *F* is well exemplified by the numerous Boeotian inscriptions. In these the general rule is that initial *F* is retained: the only word from which it is regularly absent is *ἐκαστος*. On the other hand the only instances of

* Baunack, *Die Inschrift von Gortyn*, pp. 37-39, 68.

F in the body of a word are, the compound *ῥικατὶ* *ῥέτιες* (*εἰκοσι-ετέες*), and a group of derivatives of *αἰδῶ* (*αἰλαφυδός*, *τραγαφυδός*, &c.). The same rule applies to the Arcadian inscriptions, which however are too few to be of importance. The further progress of decay may be seen in the Doric dialect of Heraclea, of which a specimen remains in the well known *Tabulae Heraclenses* (of the 4th cent.). We there find *ῥέξ*, *ῥέτος*, *ῥίδιος*, *ῥίκατι* and the compound *ἐγ-ῥηληθῶντι* (= *ἐξ-εὐληθῶσι*), but *ῥκαστος*, *ῥσος*, *ἀφ-ῥξόντι*, *πενταῖτηρίς*, *ἐργάζομαι*, *οἰκία*, *ῥήτρα* : from which it follows that the use of *F* even as an initial sound must have been fluctuating. A similar condition of at least partial loss of *F* is found in inscriptions of Melos.

If we do not confine our view to the character *F*, but look to the other indications of the sound which it represented, the most important evidence is that furnished by the Cyprian inscriptions. The forms which they yield belong, generally speaking, to an earlier period of the language than is known from alphabetical inscriptions. Yet the use of the sounds answering to *F* is not uniform : we have *Διῥός* and *Διός*, *βασιλέῥος* and *βασιλέος*.

An original *F* is represented by *β* in several parts of Greece, especially Laconia, Elis, Crete : but probably the *β* is merely a graphical substitute for *F*. It is found in the inscriptions of later times, when *β* was probably = our *v*.

The substitution of *υ* for *F* is characteristic of the Æolic of Lesbos, as *εὔιδε* (for *ῥῥιδε*), *αὔως*, *δεύομαι*, *ἐνδενής* (= *ἐνδεής*). In these forms the *F* is vocalised ; cp. Homeric *αὔιαχος* (= *ἄ-ῥίαχος*), *εὔαδε*, *ταλαύρινος*.

It is necessary here to notice a group of uses of the *F* in which it seems to have been developed from a neighbouring vowel (*υ* or *ο*). The vowel usually precedes, as in Laconian *ἐδήδοῥας*, *ἐδήδοῥε*, Corecyrean *ἀριστεύφοντα*, Boeotian *Εὔῥα*, *βακευῥαι*, Cyprian *Εὔῥέλων*, *Εὔῥαγόρω*, *κατεσκεύῥασε* : but we also find *ῥλασῥαῥο* (Corecyr.), *ῥῥλαῥαῥο* (Cypr.), *ῥιμοῥάριῥος* (Cypr.), *ῥότι* (Locr.). So perhaps the Boeotian *αἰλαφυδός*, *τραγαφυδός*, &c. (see above). With the former instances we might compare Italian *Genῥva*, *Padῥva* (for *Genua*, *Padua*) ; with the latter the *υ* of Italian *uomo*, *uopo*, the *w* of *whole*, the provincial English *wuts* for *oats*, &c. With *ῥότι* we should compare the form *Naῥπάκτιος*, also Locrian. Both are exceptional, and indeed must be considered as mere errors :* but they help to show how near *F* was to a pure vowel sound. It is evident that this redundant *F*, growing

* The ordinary form *Naῦπάκτος* occurs on the inscription 19 times, the form with *Naῥ-* only once. Similarly against the single instance of *ῥότι* are to be set 2 instances of *ῥτι*, and 5 others of the Relative *ῥς*, in the older Locrian inscription. See Allen in *Curt. Stud.* iii. p. 252 ; Brugmann, *ibid.* iv. p. 133, n. 57 : Tudeer, *De digamma*, p. 45.

out of the vowel *υ* or *ο*, is a parallel phenomenon to the loss of *F* before these vowels which was noticed above as a characteristic of Homer (§ 393).

405.] *F* in Ionic. There remains the interesting question whether the existence of the *F* in Ionic can be traced in inscriptions. The evidence appears to be as follows (Tudeer, *De digammo* &c. pp. 5 ff.):—

(1) The form *ΑΥΤΟ* (= *αὐτοῦ*) on a Naxian inscription of the end of the 6th century B.C. But, as has been pointed out,* the *F* of *ἄφυρός* indicates at most a special way of pronouncing the *υ*, and is to be compared with the erroneous *Νάφπακτος* noticed above.

(2) The name of the city of Velia, which was founded by exiles from Phocaea (*Φέλεα marshes*; but see § 393).

(3) The forms *ΦΙΟ*, *ΓΑΡΥΦΟΝΕΣ*, *ΟΦΑΤΙΕΣ*—all proper names—on vases found in Magna Graecia, and supposed to have come from Chalcis in Euboea, or one of its Italian colonies.

It is inferred by Tudeer (*l.c.*) that the *F* must have been a living sound in the Ionic dialect of Euboea at the time when the colonies of Chalcis were sent to Magna Graecia, *i.e.* probably in the 8th century B.C. On the other hand, since there is no example on the inscriptions of Euboea itself, the sound does not seem to have survived there down to the date of the earliest examples of writing, *viz.* the 6th century B.C. Hence Tudeer puts the loss of the *F* in Ionic Euboea at some time between the 8th and the 6th centuries.

It has been recently pointed out by P. Kretschmer (*K. Z.* xxxi. 285) that the Ionic change of *ā* to *η* cannot be placed very early. The name *Μῆδοι* underwent the change,—the original *ā* appears in the form *Μᾶδοι* on the monument of Idalion—and the Medes must therefore have become known to the Ionians before it was completed. The Persian names which reached Ionia later—*Δαρείος*, *Μιθριδάτης*, &c.—retain their *ā*. Similarly the old Carian *Μίλατος* became the Ionic *Μίλητος*. Hence the Ionic *η* is later than the contact of Ionians with the nations of Asia Minor. Now the anomalous *η* after *ρ* in the Attic *κόρη* and *δέρη* is to be explained from the older forms *κόρφη*, *δέρφη* (*cp.* *κόρρη* from *κόρση*). Consequently the loss of *F* in Attic must be later than the change of *ā* to *η*, and *a fortiori* later than the Ionian migration. This inference is confirmed by the *ο* of the Comparatives *κενότερος* and *στενότερος*, pointing as it does to the forms

* By Brugmann, *Curt. Stud.* iv. p. 132, n. 55, and Tudeer, p. 7.

κενFός, στενFός (since the lengthening of the ϵ , as in Ionic κεινός, στεινός, never took place in Attic).

The former use of F as a letter in all Greek alphabets is shown by its use as a numeral, and also by the existence of the first non-Phoenician letter, Υ . The addition of Υ , which was the earliest made, and perhaps contemporaneous with the introduction of the alphabet, shows that the Greeks felt the need of a vowel distinct from the labial spirant Vau. Otherwise the Phoenician Vau would have served for the vowel υ , just as the Yod was taken for the vowel ι . And as there is no Greek alphabet without Υ , it follows that the consonant F was equally universal.*

Combining these inferences with the independent evidence furnished by the metre, we may arrive at some approximate conclusions regarding the value of F in the Ionic of Homer.

(a) Initial F had the value of a consonant, except before \omicron or ω (§ 393).

(b) δF was retained, not only at the beginning of a word (§ 394), but also in $\xi\delta F\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha$, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta F\iota\alpha$, &c.: we can hardly suppose compensatory lengthening in these forms.

(c) F between vowels is more doubtful (§ 396). Since initial F was lost as early as Homer before \omicron or ω , it probably vanished before most Case-endings of the Second Declension, and before the $-\omicron\varsigma$, $-\omega\upsilon$ of the Third Declension. Thus for $\lambda\alpha F\acute{o}\varsigma$, &c. we should have $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\lambda\alpha\omicron\upsilon$, &c. (but F possibly in $\lambda\alpha F\omicron\iota$, $\lambda\alpha F\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$): and again $\eta\delta\upsilon\varsigma$, $\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$, $\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon} F\iota$, &c., $\Pi\eta\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, $\Pi\eta\lambda\eta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\Pi\eta\lambda\eta F\iota$, &c. Then other Cases might follow the analogy of the Gen. Sing. and Plur., and so drop the F altogether. However this may be, it is clear that F between vowels was generally lost much earlier than F at the beginning of the word (cp. Italian *amai* for *amavi*, &c.). The absence of contraction proves little, as we see from the Attic $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\xi\chi\epsilon\alpha$, $\xi\chi\epsilon\epsilon$, &c. At the same time we occasionally find a partial survival of F in a vocalised form, making a diphthong with the preceding vowel (§ 396).

* As the Vau is written Υ on the Moabite Stone, it has been suggested that it was the source of the Greek Υ . It seems not improbable that the letters F and Υ were at first only two forms of Vau, appropriated in course of time to the consonant F and vowel υ ,—just as our u and v come from the two uses of Latin V . If this is so, the place of Υ at the end of the then alphabet is significant, as showing the importance attached to the original order of the letters. See Roberts, *Greek Epigraphy*, § 11: Taylor, *The Alphabet*, ii. p. 82.

APPENDIX.*

C. On *η* and *ει* in Homer.

THIS seems the most convenient place for a short statement of the question as to the spelling of the Subjunctives formed from Stems in -*η*, and of some other forms about which similar doubts have arisen.

1. In the case of Stems in which -*η* represents an older -*ā* the MSS. usually have *ει* before *ο*, *ω*, but *η* before *ε*, *η*. Thus in the Subj. of *ἔβην*, *ἔστην* we find *βείω*, *στείωσι*, &c., but *βήης*, *στήετον*, &c. There are one or two exceptions: *καταβήομεν* once in A (Il. 10. 97), *ἐπιβήομεν* in good MSS. of the Odyssey (6. 262., 10. 334). Aristarchus however wrote *περιστήωσ'* in Il. 17. 95 (where all the MSS. have *περιστείωσ'*), and *βήομαι* in Il. 22. 431 (where the MSS. have either *βείομαι* or *βίομαι*): from which it may be inferred that he wrote *η* in all similar forms.

2. In the Subjunctives from Stems in -*η* (the short Stem ending in -*ε*), the MSS. always have *ει* before *ο*, *ω*, and usually before *ε*, *η*. Thus we find *θείω*, *θείης*, *θείη*, and less commonly *θήης*, *θήη*, &c. But Aristarchus wrote *θήης*, *θήη*, &c., and so in all similar cases, *δαμήη*, *σαπήη*, &c. As to *θείω*, *δαμείω*, &c., no express statement of his opinion has been preserved. If we may argue from this silence, we should infer that the question had not arisen, and therefore that with these Stems the spelling -*ειω*, -*ειομεν*, &c. was anciently universal.

3. The spelling with *ει* appears in some forms of the Aor. *ἔκηα* (for *ἔκηνα*, see § 15), esp. *κείομεν*, *κείαντες*, *κείαντο*, *κείαμενοι*, *κακ-κείαι*; also in the Pf. Part. *τεθνεύως*, and the 3 Plur. forms *εἶται*, *εἶατο*, *ἀκαχείατο*. Aristarchus certainly wrote *ἔκηα*, *τεθνηώς*: and the form *ἦαται* (for *ἦσ-αται*) is supported by ancient authority (Eust. Od. 20. 354.)

4. In the declension of Stems in -*εεσ* (for -*εφεσ-*) we sometimes find *η* throughout, as *Ἡρακλῆης*, *Ἡρακλῆϊ*, *Ἡρακλῆς*, sometimes *η* before *ει* and *ι*, but *ει* before *α*, *ο*, *ω*: as *ἀκλῆεις*, *ζαχρεῖς*, but *ἀκλειώς*, *εὐκλείας*, *εὐρρεῖος*, *ζαχρειών*. So *δείους*, *σπείους*, but *σπῆϊ*, *σπῆεσι*. In all these cases, however, the uncontracted *εε* should probably be substituted for *η* or *ει* (§ 105, 15). In *χέρηϊ*, *χέρηες*, *χέρεια* (Aristarchus and most MSS.) the origin of the long vowel is not quite certain (§ 121).

* The matter contained in the Appendix to the first edition under the headings A, B, D and E has now been incorporated with the body of the work.

5. The Attic -εω- in πλέως, κρεω-φάγος, χρεωκοπέω points to original πλήος, κρήας, χρήος, instead of the usual πλείος, κρείας, χρείος. And ἔως, τέως are for ἦος, τῆος (not εἰως, as in the MSS.).

6. So Attic -εᾶ points to -ηα, and accordingly we should have φρήαρ, στήαρ (instead of φρείαρ, &c.); and similarly ὄνηαρ.

The rule adopted by Bekker and La Roche is phonetic. They write εἰ before ο, ου, ω, α, but η before ε, ει, η, ι. Thus they give στείω, στήης; θείω, θήης; ἡμαι, εἵαται: and so on. This rule, however, is purely empirical.

On the other hand the scholars who look at the question as an etymological one are inclined to prefer η in all the instances in question. They hold that if (*e.g.*) we find the strong Stem θη- in τίθημι, θή-σω, ἔθηκα, &c., it must also be found in the Subjunctive. And they point out that in this and similar cases there is a special reason for distrusting, not only the extant MSS. (which are admittedly liable to error from itacism), but also the statements of the ancient grammarians, so far at least as they may be regarded as founded upon MSS. of the 4th century B.C. The older alphabet, which was used in Athens down to 400 B.C., employed the same character E for three distinct sounds, viz. the short ε, the long η, and (in many words) the diphthong εἰ. This would not lead to practical difficulty with a living language, but in the case of Homeric forms there was nothing to prevent confusion except the metre, and (it may be) the traditional pronunciation of the rhapsodists. There is therefore no good ground for believing that the spelling even of the 4th century B.C. could be trusted to decide between η and εἰ in *any form which was then obsolete*.

The substitution of εἰ for η, however, is not a matter of chance, but depends on the circumstance that in later Greek εἰ represented a single long vowel of the same quality as the short ε (probably a close *e*, such as French *ê*), while η was of different quality (a more open *e*, French *è*). Accordingly when Homeric η passed into ε in Attic, as in τεθυώς, τεθνεώς, there was a special tendency to make the archaic long vowel (which the metre requires) as like as possible to the ε of the living speech. So the forms στήω, βήω, θήω, στήομεν, &c. would be liable to change their η to εἰ under the influence of the New Ionic στέω, στέωμεν, &c.; and so too ἦος, τῆος became εἰώς, τεἰώς from the influence of ἔως, τέως. We may even suppose that η first became ε, and this ε was afterwards lengthened to fit the metre,—just as Wackernagel supposes ὀράω to have been changed to ὀρώ through the intermediate form ὀρῶ (§ 55).

A similar account is to be given of the forms which exhibit *ει* for *ευ* or *εφ*, as *πνέει* *breathes*, *θείειν* *to run*, *χείη* (Subj.) *shall pour*, *πλείοντες* *sailing*, *κλείουσι* *celebrate* (§ 29, 3). The original Present is preserved in *σεύω* and *δεύομαι*, cp. the Aorists *ἔχενα*, *ἠλεύατο*. When *-ευω* passed into *-εφω* and then *-εω*, the *ε* was lengthened by the force of the metre, and became *ει*. So the *ει* of *κείαντες* (for *κηάντες* or *κῆαντες*, from *καίω*) is to be attributed to the Attic 1 Aor. Part. *κέας*. But the Verbs in *-ειω* (§ 51, 3), or some of them, may be Verbs in *-ηω*: e.g. *δκνήω*, like *Æolic ποθήω*, *ἀδικήω*.

It is probable that in the same way the *ᾱ* of *φάεα* (Plur. of *φάος*), *ἄηρ*, *αἰδῶ*, *ἄασε*, *ἄϊον*, *ἄεσα*, *ἄορ*, *ἄλιας*, *ζαῖς*, &c. represents *αυ*. The lengthening cannot well be merely metrical, as in *ἀθάνατος* &c. (§ 386).

In some cases *ει* takes the place of an *ε* which was long by Position: as *δεῖδοικα* for *δέδφοικα*, and perhaps *εἶδαρ* for *ἔδ-φαρ*.

The readiness to put *ει* for *ε*, especially before a vowel, appears in Ionic inscriptions of the 4th century B.C. where we find (e.g.) the forms *δειόμενον*, *δείηται*, *δείωνται*, *ἐννεία*, *ιδρύσειως*, *πόλειως*, and Genitives in *-κλειους* (H. Weir Smyth, *The Vowel System of the Ionic Dialect*, in the *Trans. of the Am. Phil. Ass.* xx. p. 74: G. Meyer, *Griech. Gr.*² § 149). It is worth observing that these inscriptions belong to the same period as the MSS. in which, as we gather from the criticism of Aristarchus, such forms as *τεθνεῶτας*, *στεῖωσι*, *βείω*, &c. first found their way into the text.

F. Fick's theory of the Homeric dialect.

The theory put forward by Aug. Fick in his two works on Homer (*Die homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*, 1883: *Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*, 1886) admits of being stated in a very few words. He holds that the poems (with certain exceptions) were originally composed in an *Æolic* dialect; that some three centuries later (about 540 B.C.) they were translated into Ionic; and that in this process every *Æolic* word for which there was no metrically equivalent form in Ionic was simply left unchanged. Thus, in his view, was formed the Epic dialect of literature,—a dialect mainly Ionic, but with a considerable admixture of *Æolic* forms.

The arguments which Fick advances in favour of this theory are not entirely linguistic. The scene of the *Iliad*, he reminds us, is

laid in Æolis; the heroes and legends are largely those of the Æolic race; the parts of Ionia which tradition connects with Homer adjoin Æolic settlements; and Smyrna, which figures in some of the oldest traditions as his birthplace, was for a time an Æolic city. Now if the poems were first composed in some Æolic district of the north-west of Asia Minor, and passed thence to Ionia, they would take an Ionic form; and, as the result of the supremacy of Ionia in art and literature, that form, though full of anomalies and half-understood archaisms, would naturally hold its ground as the accepted text of Homer, and become the standard to which later poets, both of the Homeric and the Hesiodic school, would be obliged to conform.

The linguistic arguments upon which Fick chiefly relies are as follows:

1. The *F* or 'digamma,' which is required by the metre of Homer, is an Æolic letter, unknown to the earliest extant Ionic. Moreover the vocalisation of the *f* seen in a number of Homeric words (*αῖίαχος* and the like, § 396) is characteristically Æolic: cp. the Æolic *εὔιδε* (for *ε-φιδε*), *αῦηρ* (for *α-φήρ*), *αὔατα* (= *ἀτῆ*), &c. The prothetic *ε-* of *ἔεδνα* (*ε-φεδνα*), *ἐέικοσι*, *ἐέργω*, &c. is also Æolic.

In order to prove that *F* never existed in Ionic Fick appeals to the Ionic inscriptions, and the early Ionic poets. This evidence, however, does not go back beyond the 7th century B.C., and therefore proves nothing for the original language of Homer. As we have seen (§ 405), there is reason to believe that the loss of *F* in the Ionic dialect was subsequent to the first settlements of Ionians in Asia.

2. The Æolic accent and breathing are found in a number of Homeric words. Thus the barytone accent appears in the Nominatives in -*ᾱ* (as *μητρία*, &c.), in the Perfect forms *ἀκάχησθαι*, *ἀκαχήμενος*, *ἀλάλησθαι*, *ἀλαλήμενος*, *ἐγρήγορθαι*, also in *ἀπούρας*, *ζῆας*, *ἄλλυδις*, *πόποι*; the smooth breathing in *ἔλτο* (*ἐπ-άλμενος*), *ἔμμορε*, *ὕββάλλειν*, *ἡμβροτον*, *ἡμαρ*, *ἄμαξα*, *ἄμυδις*, *ἀμόθεν*, *ἡμος*, *ἐπ-ίστιον*, *αὐτ-όδιον* (*ὀδός*); and both peculiarities in the Pronouns *ἄμμες* and *ὑμμες*.

The answer is suggested by Fick himself,—though he makes it apply to a small part only of these forms.* It is that the accent and breathing of the Æolic words in Homer was determined by the

* 'Für ὑμμες, ὕμμιν, ὕμμε und ὕββάλλειν mag die psilose aus dem äolischen dialect erschlossen sein, in den übrigen fallen liegt wohl ächte überlieferung vor' (*Odyssee*, p. 12). Where is the evidence of any such tradition? Whenever the grammarians have to do with a form which was obsolete or archaic in their time, they are evidently quite at a loss.

living Æolic dialect. Let us take the form $\tilde{\alpha}\mu\mu(\nu)$ as a typical instance. Fick holds that the Æolic $\tilde{\alpha}\mu\mu(\nu)$ was adopted by the Ionic reciters and preserved with all its Æolic features—the double μ , the smooth breathing, the barytone accent—for several generations, because the Ionic $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ is metrically different (— instead of — ∪). The alternative is to suppose that the original Homeric language had a form with short ι —as in Doric $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ —and that in later times, when this form had gone out of use, the Æolic $\tilde{\alpha}\mu\mu(\nu)$ took its place in the text. Such a substitution is eminently natural. The rhapsodists were doubtless familiar with the Æolic Pronouns, and their adoption of the form $\tilde{\alpha}\mu\mu(\nu)$ was simply putting the known in place of the unknown. In the case of $\tilde{\nu}\mu\mu(\nu)$ and $\iota\beta\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ Fick himself takes this view. But if the form $\tilde{\nu}\mu\mu(\nu)$ was maintained by the influence of contemporary Æolic, we need go no further for an explanation of the whole group of forms of which it is the type.

3. Several of the inflexional forms of Æolic are more or less frequent in Homer, and their occurrence, according to Fick, is subject to a law which holds almost without exception, viz. that the Æolic form is used (1) whenever the corresponding Ionic form is different in quantity, and therefore is not admitted by the metre, and (2) when the word itself is wanting in Ionic. In either case the simple substitution of Ionic for Æolic was impossible. On the other hand the Ionic of Homer can be translated back into Æolic without encountering any difficulty of the kind.

The forms to which Fick applies his argument are: the Fem. Voc. in $-\tilde{\alpha}$ ($\nu\acute{\upsilon}\mu\phi\tilde{\alpha}$), the Gen. in $-\omicron\iota\omicron$ ($-\omicron\omicron$), $-\tilde{\alpha}\omicron$, $-\tilde{\alpha}\omega\nu$: the Dat. Plur. in $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota(\nu)$: the Gen. of Pronouns in $-\theta\epsilon\nu$: the forms $\tilde{\alpha}\mu\mu\epsilon\varsigma$, $\tilde{\alpha}\mu\mu\iota\nu$, $\tilde{\nu}\mu\mu\epsilon\varsigma$, $\tilde{\nu}\mu\mu\iota\nu$, $\tilde{\nu}\mu\mu\epsilon$: the Pres. in $-\tilde{\alpha}\omega$, $-\eta\omega$ ($-\epsilon\iota\omega$), $-\omega\omega$: the Inf. in $-\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ and $-\mu\epsilon\nu$: the Pf. Part. in $-\omega\nu$ (as $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\gamma\omega\nu$ for $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\eta\gamma\acute{\omega}\varsigma$): the Nouns in $-\tilde{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$, $-\tilde{\alpha}\omega\nu$ ($\lambda\alpha\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\delta\acute{\rho}\alpha\omega\nu$, $\delta\iota\delta\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$, and many proper names); $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$, Ναυσικάα , and some proper names in $-\epsilon\iota\tilde{\alpha}$, $-\epsilon\iota\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ (in Ionic $-\epsilon\eta\varsigma$). Other Æolic words in Homer are $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ($\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega\varsigma$), $\pi\acute{\lambda}\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ ($\pi\acute{\lambda}\epsilon\omicron\nu\epsilon\varsigma$), $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\upsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ (Ion. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma$), $\eta\mu\beta\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu$ ($\eta\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\nu$)—all metrically different from the Ionic form. In several instances the corresponding Ionic form would have suited the metre, but was not in use; so $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ (Ionic only $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$), $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\text{---}\pi\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega\nu$ (Æol. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tilde{\alpha}\mu\alpha\iota=\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\mu\alpha\iota$), $\tilde{\epsilon}\mu\mu\omicron\rho\epsilon$ (in Ionic only Middle $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\alpha\rho\mu\alpha\iota$), $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\eta\mu\alpha\rho$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\gamma\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\nu}\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\beta\epsilon\nu\acute{\nu}\omicron\varsigma$. So $\delta\pi\pi\omega\varsigma$ was retained because the Ionic form was $\delta\kappa\omega\varsigma$, never $\delta\kappa\kappa\omega\varsigma$: and $\delta\pi\pi\omega\varsigma$ again led to the retention of $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$.

In order to determine how far these forms are proofs of an Æolic

Homer, it is necessary to distinguish between those which are specifically Æolic, i.e. Æolic modifications of a common original, and those which are simply the older forms, which Ionic and other dialects modified each in its own way. To the latter class belong the Gen. endings -οιο (Indo-Eur. -osyo), -ᾱο, -ᾱων (New Ion. -εω, -εων), the Voc. in -ᾶ, the Inf. in -μεναι, -μεν. These are forms which would be found everywhere in Greece, if we could trace the different dialects far enough back. They are 'Æolic' only because they were retained in Æolic (among other dialects), but were altered or lost in Attic and Ionic. The same may be said of the endings of the Pronouns ἄμμες, &c. They appear also in the corresponding Doric forms ἄμές, ὕμές, Dat. ἄμῖν, ὕμῖν, Acc. ἄμέ, ὕμέ. In these cases, then, we only know that a form is *archaic*, not that it belongs to any one dialect.*

On the other hand there are some forms to which this account does not apply. The Dat. Plur. in -εσσι is not proved to be 'Pan-hellenic,' and is certainly less primitive than the form in -σι (§ 102). The case stands thus: Ionic has only -σι, Æolic only -εσσι, in Homer both are found (-εσσι being rather less frequent). Therefore, says Fick, the language of Homer is Æolic,—not the later Æolic, in which every Dat. Plur. ended in -εσσι, but an earlier, in which -εσσι had begun to take the place of -σι. The same may be said *mutatis mutandis* of the Genitives ἐμέθεν, σίθεν, ἔθεν, and the Participles κεκλήγων, κεκόπων (§ 27). The argument here has greater weight than in the case of Pan-hellenic inflexions, but it is not conclusive. The forms now in question are not confined to Æolic: they appear occasionally in Doric, and in the dialects of northern Greece. There was therefore a general tendency towards these forms, and the dialect of Homer may have shared in this tendency without being thereby proved to be non-Ionic.

In the case of the Genitives in -οιο and the Voc. in -ᾶ the argument may be pressed somewhat further. The forms -οιο and -ου, which are found together in Homer, represent different steps of a phonetic process (-οιο, -οιο, -οο, -ου): therefore they cannot have subsisted together in any spoken dialect, and -οιο in Homer must be an archaism, preserved by literary tradition. This conclusion is

* Undue stress has been laid upon the variety of forms of the Infinitive in Homer: e. g. θέμεναι, θέμεν, θεῖναι. Originally there were as many Infinitive endings as there were different ways of forming an abstract Substantive. In Vedic Sanscrit, where the Infinitive is less developed than in Greek, the variety of formation is much greater (Whitney, § 970).

confirmed by the Homeric use of the ending (§ 149, 3). If then Fick is right in regarding -οιο in Alcaeus as taken from the living Æolic of Lesbos (*Odyssee*, p. 14), it follows that Lesbian retained a form which had died out of the supposed old Æolic of Homer's time. Again, the Fem. Voc. in -ᾱ appears to be regular in Lesbian Æolic : whereas in Homer it is found only in the isolated *νύμφᾱ*. This is therefore another point in which historical Æolic is more primitive than Homer. The argument would apply also to the Gen. in -ᾱο and -ᾱων, if it were certain that -εω and -εων belong to the original Homeric language.

4. Among the forms now in question there are many instances of *ā* for which Ionic must have had *η*, and which therefore—Fick argues—cannot have come to Homer from Ionic. Such are, the Gen. in -ᾱο, -ᾱων, which must have appeared in Old Ionic as -ηο, -ηων, whence New Ionic -εω, -εων : the Participles *πεινᾶων*, *διψᾶων* : the Nouns in -ᾱος, -ᾱων : the word *θεά*, and some proper names, *Ἐρμείας*, *Αἰνείας*, *Ῥεΐα*, *Φεΐα*, *Ναυσικᾶα* : the words *λᾱας*, *ἀήρ* (Gen. *ἡέρος*), *δαήρ* (§ 106, 1), *τετρ-άρος* (Od. 13. 81), perhaps also the Perfects *ἑᾱδῶς*, *ἔᾱγα* (§ 22, 1). The normal change to *η* appears in *νηῦς* (*νηός* for *νηφός*, &c.), *νηός* *temple*, *ἡώς*, *ἡέλιος*, *παρ-ήρος*, *δήμιος* (Æol. *δαῖμιος*), *κληῖς*, *ρήτιδος*, *πηός*. Against the Nouns in -ᾱων we can only set the single form *παϊήων*.

In the first place, it is very probable (as has been shown in § 405), that the Ionic of Homer's time still had the sound of *ā* in all these forms. This however is not a complete answer to Fick. We have to explain how this primitive *ā* was retained in these particular cases, when the change of *ā* to *η* took place generally in the dialect. For we can hardly suppose that the change of -ᾱο, -ᾱων to -ηο, -ηων (on the way to -εω, -εων) could have been made in the spoken language without extending to the recitation of poetry.

The true answer seems to be that the retention of *ā* in Homer was due, generally speaking, to the influence of the literary dialects, especially Attic and Æolic.

Let us take the case of *λαός* (*λαφός*), which in some ways is typical. The Ionic form *ληός* is quoted from Hipponax (fr. 88 Bergk), and is preserved, as Nauck acutely perceived (*Mél. gr.-rom.* iii. 268), in the Homeric proper names *Λήϊτος*, *Δειώκριτος* (for *Ληόκριτος*), and *Δειώδης* (*Ληο-φάδης*). Fick supposes that when Homer was translated into Ionic the form *ληός* had become antiquated, and accordingly, as *λεός* was metrically different, *λαός* was retained. If so, however, the proper names would *à fortiori* have remained in their Æolic form

(*Δᾶϊτος, Λαόκριτος*), just as the older form **θέρσος* for *θάρσος* is preserved in the names *Θερσίτης, Θερσίλοχος, Ἀλιθέρης, Πολυθερσεΐδης, &c.* For in a proper name a stem is comparatively isolated, and thus may escape the influence of later usage. It follows that there was a time when *ληός* was the proper Homeric form. Why then do we find *λαός* in our text? Doubtless because it was the established form in Old Attic, and in other dialects familiar to the rhapsodists of the 6th and 5th centuries. In the case of so common a word this influence was sufficient to change *ληός* back into *λαός*, or (it may be) to prevent the change to *ληός* from taking place.*

The same considerations apply to *ἱλᾶος*, the form *ἱληος* occurring on a metrical inscription (Epigr. Kaib. 743, quoted by Nauck, *Mél. gr.-rom.* iv. 579): and to the name *Ἀμφιδράωσ*, for which *Ἀμφιδράωσος* was read by Zenodotus (Schol. Od. 15. 244), and is found in the MSS. of Pindar. So we find in Il. 11. 92 *Βιήνορα* (MSS.), *Βιάνορα* (Aristarchus); in Il. 14. 203 *Ψείης* (MSS.), *Ψείας* (Ar. Aristoph.); in Il. 13. 824 *βουγάϊε* (Ar. and MSS.), *βουγίϊε* (Zenod.); in Il. 18. 592 *Ἀριήδνη* (Zenod. — for *Ἀριάδνη*?); in Od. 13. 81 *τετράοροι*, but elsewhere in Homer *συνήορος, παρήορος*. These variations show that the question between *ᾱ* and *η* was often unsettled even in Alexandrian times†. On the same principle Fick would read *Ποσειδήωνος* in Archilochus (fr. 10), comparing the month *Ποσιδηίων* (Anacr. fr. 6).

As a negative instance, we may notice the case of *ἔως* and *τέως*. These go back to a primitive Greek *ἔφος, τᾶφος*, which would become in Old Ionic *ἦος, τῆος*, in New Ionic and Attic *ἔως, τέως*. The existence in Homer of such metrical deformities as *ἔως ὁ ταῦθ' ὄρμαινε* is proof that later usage had the strongest influence on the formation of the text.

The *ᾱ* of Genitives in *-ᾶο* and *-ᾶων* (for *-ᾶσων*) stands on a somewhat different footing, since the loss of the intervening spirant is much more ancient. Hence it is possible that the change to an *E*-sound took place after the *ᾱ* in these endings had been shortened,

* The occurrence of *λαός* in Callinus (i. 18) and Xenophanes (ii. 15) shows that it became the usual Epic form from a very early time.

† Note however that Zenodotus sometimes gave *η* for *ᾱ* where the true Ionic form had *ᾱ*: thus he read *ὀρήτο* for *ὀρᾶτο* (Il. 1. 198), *κρητός* for *κρατός* (Il. 1. 530). Perhaps *βουγίϊος* and *Ἀριήδνη* fall under this head: and *ὄρηαι*, which stands in our text (Od. 14. 343), is to be placed with *ὀρήτο*. The most probable account of these forms surely is that they are 'hyper-Ionic,' i.e. are produced by the habit of regarding *η* as in every case the Ionic equivalent of Attic *ᾱ*. On this view they are parallel to the hyper-Doric forms which are produced by indiscriminately turning Attic *η* into *ᾱ*.

in other words, that the steps were $\bar{\alpha}o$, $\bar{\alpha}\omega$, $\epsilon\omega$ and $\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$, $\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$, $\epsilon\omega\nu$ (not $\bar{\alpha}o$, ηo , &c.). It is also not improbable that the shortening had taken place in the time of Homer, so that $\bar{\alpha}o$ and $\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$ were then archaic (as oio almost certainly was). There are 54 instances of the Gen. Plur. Fem. in $\epsilon\omega\nu$ ($\bar{\omega}\nu$) in Homer, against 306 in $\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$ (Menrad, pp. 36, 38). Considering the strength of tradition in such matters we may infer that the vowel was doubtful in quantity, if not actually short, in the spoken language of the time. As to $\bar{\alpha}o$ see § 376, 1. Now if the forms in $\bar{\alpha}o$ and $\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$ were then archaic, they might be exempted, by the force of a poetical tradition, from the general phonetic law or tendency which turned $\bar{\alpha}$ into η in the Ionic dialect. And the influence of Old Attic and other literary dialects which retained the $\bar{\alpha}$ would operate the more decisively. However this may be, it is clear that the causes which retained the $\bar{\alpha}$ of $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}s$, $\nu\alpha\acute{o}s$, $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}o\pi o s$, $\xi\nu\rho\acute{\alpha}o\pi o s$, $\delta\acute{\alpha}o s$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}o s$, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\bar{\alpha}\mu\alpha i$ in the Old Attic of tragedy, may have operated at an earlier time in favour of $\bar{\alpha}o$ and $\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$.

The question between $\bar{\alpha}$ and ϵ in the later form of these endings would naturally be settled by the example of Ionic in favour of $\epsilon\omega$, $\epsilon\omega\nu$: but it is worth noticing that the result has not been the same in the Gen. of Neuters in $\bar{\alpha}s$ (§ 107, 3). Here the Ionic ϵ appears in Homer in the declension of $o\ddot{u}d\alpha s$, $\kappa\acute{\omega}\alpha s$, $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha s$, but not in $\gamma\acute{\eta}\rho\alpha - o s$, $\delta\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha} - \omega\nu$, $\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha} - \omega\nu$. The tendency to uniformity works much more powerfully on a large class of words, such as the Nouns in $\bar{\alpha}$ (η), than on a small group, like the Neuters in $\bar{\alpha}s$. But the survival of $\bar{\alpha}o s$, $\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$ in the latter makes it probable that $\bar{\alpha}\omega$, $\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$ were at one time the Homeric forms, anterior to $\epsilon\omega$, $\epsilon\omega\nu$.*

A singular problem is presented by the $\bar{\alpha}$ in the two forms $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$ (Acc. $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu\tau\alpha$) and $\delta\epsilon\psi\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$, as to which see § 55, 8. As these verbs belong to the small group in which contraction gives η instead of $\bar{\alpha}$, it seems at first sight strange that they should be the only examples of $\bar{\alpha}\omega\nu$ in the Participle. But the connexion between the two phenomena appears when we consider that the contraction in $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\eta\eta s$, &c. implies the steps $\bar{\alpha}\epsilon > \eta\epsilon > \eta$, consequently that the exceptional feature in it is precisely the retention of the long vowel. Thus it remains only to explain the combination $\bar{\alpha}\omega$, $\bar{\alpha}o$, which in Ionic should become $\eta\omega$, ηo .

* The fact that $\epsilon\omega$ and $\epsilon\omega\nu$ are scanned with synizesis, except in $\theta\upsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ and $\nu\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$, is unimportant. Obviously an ending such as $\epsilon\omega\nu$ can only be scanned \cup - when it is preceded by one, and not more than one, short syllable. It will be found that $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\eta$ and $\pi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta$ are the only Nouns in η which fulfil this condition.

5. In his earlier work on the *Odyssey* Fick recognised both $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ and $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ as Homeric; but subsequently he came to the conclusion that $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ is everywhere due to the Ionic translators (*Ilias*, p. xxiii). His main argument is that of the 43 instances of $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ in the Ionic poets (Archilochus, &c.) there are not more than 21 in which it could be changed into $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ ($\kappa\epsilon$, κ') without affecting the metre, whereas in Homer the change can be made in a much larger proportion of cases. The inference is that in making the change in Homer we are restoring the original form. But his induction is far too narrow. In the first three books of Apollonius Rhodius there are 46 instances of $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$, and only 13 in which it cannot be changed into $\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$. Again in *Æschylus* (excluding chorus) there are 212 instances of $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$, of which 73 are unchangeable. In the *Ædipus Tyrannus* the number is 31 out of 107. In the *Iliad*, without counting $\tilde{\eta}\nu$ and $\epsilon\pi\tilde{\eta}\nu$, the instances of unchangeable $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ are 43 out of 156. This is nearly the same proportion; and we admit that in a few cases $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ has replaced an original $\kappa\epsilon\nu$. Moreover it has been already shown, on quite independent grounds, that the combination $\omicron\kappa\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ is Homeric (§ 362). There can be little doubt, therefore, that while $\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$ is distinctive of *Æolic*, as $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ of *Ionic* and *Attic*, the Homeric dialect possessed both Particles. It may seem strange that $\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$, which is commoner than $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ in Homer, should have died out of *Ionic*. On the other hand $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ was the more emphatic Particle, and the desire of emphasis is a frequent cause of change in the vocabulary of a language.

It may be objected that we have still to explain the remarkable coincidence on which Fick's argument rests, viz. the fact that in so many cases the non-Ionic forms are precisely those which are different in metrical value from the Ionic equivalents. The answer is that the same coincidence would be found with *archaisms* of any dialect. It is only the metre of Homer (generally speaking) that has preserved or could preserve such things. Why do we find (e.g.) $\sigma\tilde{\eta}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\sigma\tilde{\eta}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, but $\sigma\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$, $\sigma\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\eta}$, $\sigma\tilde{\eta}\omega\varsigma\iota$ (not $\sigma\tilde{\eta}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\sigma\tilde{\eta}\epsilon\iota$, $\sigma\tilde{\eta}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\iota$)? Evidently because the metre admits the modernised forms in the latter case, not in the former. Thus all words or inflexions which do not belong to the New *Ionic* or *Attic* dialect, be they Old *Ionic* or Old *Æolic*, will be found to be metrically different from the later forms.

It has been sought thus far to show that phenomena which Fick explains by supposing a translation from *Æolic* into New *Ionic* may

be equally well accounted for, partly by the changes which must have taken place within the Attic-Ionic dialect itself, and partly by the influence of the post-Homeric spoken language. We may now consider what Homeric peculiarities cannot be explained on Fick's principles, and may therefore be held to turn the scale in favour of the alternative view.

(a) The Dual is wanting in the earliest Æolic, whereas it is in living use in Homer, and also in Attic down to the 5th century B.C. It is true, as Fick urges, that the loss of the Dual may have taken place in Æolic between the 9th and the 7th centuries. But the gap thus made between the earliest known Æolic and the supposed Æolic of Homer is a serious weakening of his case.

(b) The moveable *-ν* is unknown in Æolic, as also in New Ionic. Fick strikes it out whenever it is possible to do so, but is very far from banishing it from the text. Thus in the first book of the *Iliad* he has to leave it in ll. 45, 60, 66, 73, 77, &c.

(c) The psilosis which Fick introduces (*ἀπρή* for *ἀφίει*, &c.) is common to Æolic and New Ionic. Why then does it not appear in Homer?

(d) The forms of the type of *ὀρώω*, *ὀρόωντες*, &c. (§ 55) are not accounted for by Fick's theory. This is recognised by Fick himself (*Odys.* p. 2). He adopts the view of Wackernagel, supposing that the Attic forms *ὀρῶν*, *ὀρῶντες* were introduced into the recension of Pisistratus, and that these were afterwards made into *ὀρόων*, *ὀρόωντες* to fit the metre. This view is doubtless in the main correct. Setting aside the mythical 'recension of Pisistratus,' and putting in its place the long insensible influence of Attic recitation upon the Homeric text, we obtain a probable account of *ὀρώω*, and of much besides. But it can hardly be reconciled with a translation into New Ionic about 540 B.C. It is uncertain, indeed, whether the New Ionic form was *ὀρέω* or *ὀρῶ* (see H. Weir Smyth, *Vowel-system* &c. p. 111); but the argument holds in either case. If the form was *ὀρέω* (as is made probable by the Homeric *ὀμόκλεον*, &c. § 55, 10), that form is metrically equivalent to the original, and on Fick's theory would have been adopted. If it was *ὀρῶ*, which is metrically different, then on Fick's theory the original Æolic would have been retained.

(e) The forms *ῥῶς* and *τέως*, as has been already noticed, have crept into the text in spite of the metre; on Fick's theory the original *ῥῶς* and *ῥῶς* must have been preserved.

(f) Many Attic peculiarities may be noted: *οὖν* for *ὄν* (which Aristarchus counted among the proofs that Homer was an Athenian): *πῶς*, *πότε*, &c. for *κῶς*, *κότε*, &c.: the two Genitives *δείου*s and *σπείου*s (for *δέεος*, *σπέεος*): Neuters in *-ας*, Gen. *-αος* (instead of *-εος*): *ἄρσῃν* (for Æolic and Ionic *ἔρσῃν*): *τέσσαρες* for Ionic *τέσσερες*; *κρείσσων*, *μείζων* for *κρέσσων*, *μέζων*. Cp. also *ἔαγα* (Ionic *ἔηγα*), and *ἑᾶδῶτα* (§ 22, 1), for which Ionic analogy would require *ἑήδῶτα*.

(g) The Æolic forms *ἄμμι(ν)*, *ἔμμι(ν)* are not used quite consistently: thus we find the form *ἄμμιν* in three places (Il. 13. 379., 14. 85, Od. 12. 275), but *ἡμῖν* in three others (Od. 8. 569., 11. 344., 17. 376). On Fick's theory *ἡμιν*, if it was an Ionic form, would have been adopted. Again *ἔμμιν* is occasionally used where *ἑμῖν* is admitted by the metre (Il. 10. 380, Od. 4. 94., 20. 367).

Several of these arguments may be met by admitting an *Atticising* tendency, subsequent to the Ionicising which Fick supposes. Some such Attic influence clearly was exerted, and also an Æolic influence (as Fick allows in the case of *ἔμμες*). But if the Ionic Homer only dates from 540 B.C., what room is there for these other processes? And if we suppose a *modernising* process, as wide in place and time as the knowledge of Homer, but in which Attic and Ionic naturally predominated, what ground is left for an original Æolic element?

(h) The Iterative forms in *-εσκον* (§ 48) appear to be characteristic of Homer and also of later Ionic. This is one of the points—in the nature of the case not numerous—in which the Ionic character of Homer is guaranteed by the metre.

Another point of this kind is the use of *μέν* in *ἦ μέν, καὶ μέν*, and other combinations where Attic would have *μήν* (§ 345). On the other side it may be said that the retention of *μάν* (see § 342) was due to the want of the form *μήν* in Ionic. But if *μάν* were an original Æolic form we should expect on Fick's theory to find it in the older parts of the *Odyssey* as well as in the *Iliad*.

Other words which show a difference of quantity between the Homeric and the Æolic forms are: *Πρίαμος* (Æol. *Πέρραμος*), *τρίτος* (Æol. *τέρτος*), *κᾶλός* (Æol. *κᾶλος*, see Meyer, *G. G.* § 65).

The ancients supposed that Homer of set purpose employed a mixture of dialects. Modern scholars have condemned this notion as uncritical, but have generally held that his language is a poetical and conventional one, a *Sängersprache*, never used in actual speech. It may be allowed that there is a measure of truth in both these views,

provided that we distinguish between the dialect of the time of Homer and the 'Epic' of our texts. For—

1. Even in the time of Homer there was doubtless an element of conventionality in the style and vocabulary, and even in the grammatical forms of poetry. Such phrases as *μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, νήδυμος* (or *ἡδυμος*) *ὑπνος, ἀνὰ πολέμοιο γεφύρας*, are used with little or no sense of their original meaning, but evidently as part of a common poetical stock. Doubtless the Gen. in *-οιο* was already poetical, perhaps also the Gen. in *-ᾶο* and in *-ᾶων*. These forms then were genuinely Homeric, but not part of the living speech of the time.

2. Many primitive Homeric forms were lost in Ionic and Attic, but survived elsewhere in Greece. These seemed to the ancients to be borrowed from the dialects in which they were known in historical times, and thus gave support to the notion of a mixture of dialects.

3. The poems suffered a gradual and unsystematic because generally unconscious process of modernising, the chief agents in which were the rhapsodists, who wandered over all parts of Greece and were likely to be influenced by all the chief forms of literature. In this way forms crept in from various dialects,—from Ionic, from Lesbian Æolic, and from Attic. The latter stages of this process may be traced in the various readings of the ancient critics, and even in our MSS., in which a primitive word or form is often only partially displaced by that of a later equivalent. The number of instances of this kind may be materially increased as the MSS. of Homer become better known.

Other Notes and Corrections.

§ 23, 5 (p. 27). With the instances here given we may place the Cretan *καταφελμένοι*, which occurs in the inscription of Gortyn with the meaning *gathered together, assembled* (cp. Homeric *ἐλμένοι crowded*). Baunack however takes it for *καταφηλμένοι*, supposing loss of *F* and contraction from *καταφεφελμένοι*.

§ 27 (p. 30). The Present *ἀκούω I hear* appears to be originally a Perfect which has gone through the process here exemplified. The true Present form is *ἀκεύω*, which survived in Cyprus (*ἀκεύει τηρεῖ Κύπριοι*) and Crete (*Law of Gortyn*, ii. 17). Hence the Attic *ἀκήκοα* (for *ἀκ-ήκουα*), and presumably also an earlier form **ἄκουα*, formed like *ἄνωγα*, and passing into *ἀκούω* as *ἄνωγα* passed into *ἀνώγω*. This

explains the use of ἀκούω with the Perfect meaning (§ 72, 4), which accordingly is not quite parallel to the similar use of πυνθάνομαι, μανθάνω, &c. Other Homeric examples are διώκω (§ 29), in which the want of reduplication may be original (§ 23, 5), and ἰλήκω (§ 22, 9, δ.). The form ἦκω, which is probably of this nature, occurs in our MSS. of Homer (Il. 5. 473., 18. 406, Od. 13. 325., 15. 329), but Bekker substituted the undoubtedly Homeric ἴκω (La Roche, *H. T.* 287).

The form ἐνένιπε *rebuked*, which occurs several times in Homer (usually with the variants ἐνένιπτε and ἐνένισπε), should perhaps be placed here. It is usually classed as a Reduplicated Aorist (so Curt. *Verb.* ii. 26), but there is no analogy for this, and the Homeric passages do not prove that it is an Aorist. The ι of the stem may be due to the influence of the Pres. ἐνίπτω and the Noun ἐνιπή (cp. § 25, 3). Buttmann acutely compared it with ἐπέπληγον, which is evidently related to πλήσσω and πληγή as ἐνένιπον to ἐνίπτω (ἐνίσσω) and ἐνιπή. The reduplication is of the type of ἐρέριπτο.

§ 42 (p. 44). The Aor. ἐράφην, which occurs four times in our texts of the Iliad, is probably post-Homeric. In Il. 2. 661 for the vulgate τράφη ἐν (μεγάρῳ) nearly all MSS. have τράφ' ἐνί. If this is right we should doubtless read τράφ' ἐνί in the two similar places, Il. 3. 201 and 11. 222. In Il. 23. 84 the MSS. have ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ ὡς ἐράφην περ, with the *v.l.* ἐράφηνμεν: the quotation in Æschines (Timarch. 149) gives ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐράφεμέν περ, from which Buttmann (*Ausf. Sprachl.* ii. 307) restored ὡς δ' ὁμοῦ ἐράφομέν περ. On the other hand the Thematic ἔτραφον occurs with intransitive or passive meaning in Il. 5. 555., 21. 279 (where ἔτραφ' is the only possible reading), and in the recurring phrase γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε. The variation in the MSS. (including the *vox nihili* ἐράφεμεν) is sufficient evidence of the comparative lateness of the forms of ἐράφην. Buttmann's reading (adopted by Nauck) is supported by the apodosis in l. 91 ὡς δὲ καὶ ὁστέα κτλ. See Christ (*Proll.* p. 115) to whom I am indebted for the reference to Buttmann.

§ 62 (p. 56). The derivative verbs in -αῖω are often frequentative or intensive, but with a tone of contempt: e.g. μμνάζω *I loiter*, ἀλυσκάζω *I shirk*, πτωσκάζω *I cower* (stronger than πτώσσω, cp. Il. 4. 371 τί πτώσσεις, τί δ' ὀπιπύεις πολέμοιο γεφύρας; οὐ μὲν Τυδεΐ γ' ὤδε φίλον πτωσκαζέμεν ἦεν): ἀκονάζομαι *I please myself with hearing* (Il. 4. 343 δαιτὸς ἀκονάζεσθον, Od. 13. 9 ἀκονάζεσθε δ' αἰδοῦ): so νεύω and νευστάζω (Il. 20. 162), μίγνυμι and μιγάζομαι (Od. 8. 271), ῥίπτω and ῥιπτάζω, ἐρύω and ῥυστάζω, εἰλύω and εἰλυφάζω,

§ 67 (p. 61). With *ἰνδανον* compare the Aor. form *ἔηξα* (for *ἔαξα*), preserved in the text of Zenodotus in Il. 13. 166 (*ξυνέηξε* for *ξυνέαξε*) and 257 (*κατέηξαμεν* for *κατέαξαμεν*). In this case the change to *η* did not make its way into the vulgate—perhaps because the form *ἦξα*, which suggested it, was a rarer word than *ἰνδανον*.

§ 71 (p. 63). The use of the Present stem to express *relative* time is well exemplified by the following sentence from an early Attic inscription: *εἰσπραξάντων αὐτοὺς οἱ ἡρημένοι, συνεισπραττόντων δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ οἱ στρατηγοί* (Meisterhans, § 48 a.).

§ 72, 2, n. 2 (p. 64). In the Law of Gortyn *ἄγω* and *φέρω* are employed where the Aor. is the usual tense: see especially i. 12 *ἀὶ δ' ἀννίοιτο μὴ ἄγην* *if he deny that he has taken away* (Baunack, *Die Inschrift von Gortyn*, p. 79).

§ 77 (p. 66). Some valuable remarks on this and similar uses of the Aor. Part. are to be found in an article by Mr. Frank Carter in the *Classical Review* (Feb. 1891, p. 4). He observes that it is really a *timeless* use, *i.e.* that the speaker does not wish to indicate a relation in time between the action of the Participle and that of the finite verb. The Participle expresses a predication, but one which is only a part or essential circumstance of that which the verb expresses. See below, on § 245, 1.

§ 80 (p. 68). As to the MS. authority for some forms of the Pf. Subj. see § 283, a.

§ 92 (p. 79). The Nominative is used for the Vocative in the case of oxytones in *-ων*, and all Nouns in *-ην* (Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 206, p. 544).

§ 99* (p. 84). To the examples of metaplastic Neut. Plur. used with collective meaning add *ἔσπερα evening-time* (Od. 17. 191), *νεῦρα sinews* (used in Il. 16. 316 of *one* bowstring), *πλευρά side* (Il. 4. 468), *παρεῖά cheeks* (Neut. Plur. in Il. 22. 491 according to Aristarchus). It may be suspected that *ἑρεμῖα oars* belongs to this group, since the Sing. in later Greek is always *ἑρεμῖος*, and a Neut. *ἑρεμῖον* is contrary to analogy, and only rests on the phrase *εὐήρες ἑρεμῖον* (Od.), for which we can read *εὐήρε' ἑρεμῖον*.

§ 102 (p. 86). It appears that the stems in *-ā* originally formed a Loc. Plur. in *-ās* (as well as *-āsu* and *-āsi*): hence Lat. *forās, aliās, devās* (Inscr.). Hence it is possible that the few Homeric forms in *-aus* or *-ης* which cannot be written *-ησ'* represent this *-ās* (Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 358, p. 704).

§ 110 (p. 95). The question between *πάντη* and *πάντη* cannot be

decided, as Joh. Schmidt supposes (*Pluralb.* p. 40), by the circumstance that the final vowel is frequently shortened before another vowel in Homer. It is true, as was observed by Hoffmann (*Quaest. Hom.* i. p. 58, quoted by Schmidt *l.c.*), that final η is oftener shortened than final η . In the first four books of the Iliad and Odyssey, as Hartel shows (*Hom. Stud.* ii. p. 5), $-\eta$ is shortened 41 times, $-\eta$ 19 times: and further examination confirms this ratio. But, as Hartel also points out, $-\eta$ occurs in Homer about three times as often as $-\eta$: consequently the shortening of $-\eta$ is *relatively* more frequent.

§ 116, 4 (p. 109). For $\eta\delta\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\mu\acute{\eta}$ in Od. 12. 369 we may read $\eta\delta\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\mu\acute{\eta}\nu$, as suggested by Baumeister on Hom. H. Merc. 110.

§ 116, 5 (p. 109). $\iota\gamma\iota\varsigma$ has been explained as a Compound, viz. of the prefix *su-* (*su-manas*, &c.) and a stem from the root *jyd* (Saussure, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* vi. 161).

§ 117 (p. 110). Adjectives in $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$ are often used with some of the meaning of a Comparative, *i.e.* in words which imply a contrast between two sides: as in $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ *evening* and $\eta\acute{\omicron}\iota\omicron\varsigma$ or $\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ *morning*, $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$ *day* and $\nu\acute{\iota}\chi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ *night*, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (cp. $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\rho\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$), $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ (cp. $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omega}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$), $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (opposed to *dry land*), $\nu\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\xi\epsilon\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (opp. to *north* and *east*), $\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\xi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$. The suffix serves to form a kind of softened Superlative in $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and $\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$, lit. 'of the last': and the same analogy yields $\delta\sigma\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$ from $\delta\sigma\sigma\omicron\varsigma$, a formation like Lat. *quantulus*. The Comparative force of $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in the Pronouns is noticed by Brugmann (see § 114, p. 101).

§ 121 (p. 115 foot). The ω of $\sigma\phi\acute{\omega}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$, &c. has lately been discussed by J. Wackernagel (*Das Dehnungsgesetz der griech. Composita*, pp. 5 ff.). He treats it along with the ω which we find in $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\theta\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\sigma\epsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$, &c., also in $\iota\epsilon\rho\omega\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$, and shows that if we derive it from a Case-form in $-\omega$ (as $\kappa\alpha\tau\omega\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$ from $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$, &c.), we have still to explain the rhythmical law according to which ω and \omicron interchange: for a law which governed common speech in all periods cannot have arisen merely from the needs of the hexameter. Accordingly he connects the phenomenon with a rhythmical lengthening of final short vowels (among others of the final ι of the Locative, see § 378), which is found in Vedic Sanscrit.

$\lambda\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Od. 2. 350) points to a Homeric form $\lambda\alpha\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron\varsigma}$, which we can always substitute for $\lambda\alpha\rho\acute{\omicron\varsigma}$. It is probably for $\lambda\alpha\sigma\text{-}\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron\varsigma}$ from $\lambda\alpha\sigma\text{-}$ *desire*: see Curtius, *Grundz.* p. 361 (5th edit.).

§ 125, 8 (p. 121). This peculiar lengthening in the second member of a Compound has been explained by Wackernagel (*Dehnungsgesetz*,

pp. 21 ff.) as the result of a primitive contraction, or Crasis, with the final vowel of the first part: *e.g.* δμώνυμος for δμο-ονυμος. The chief argument for this view is that the lengthening is only found in stems beginning with a vowel—a fact which can hardly be accounted for on any other supposition. Such cases as δυσώνυμος, in which no contraction can have taken place, may be extensions by *analogy* of the original type. It is to be understood of course that the contraction was governed by different laws from those which obtain in the Greek which we know. The chief rule is that the resulting long vowel is fixed by the *second* of the two concurrent vowels: δμήγυρις for δμο-αγυρις, πεμπώβολον for πεμπε-οβολον, &c. Whether this was a primitive phonetic rule, or partly due to the working of analogy, it finds an exact parallel in the Temporal Augment, which must have been due to the influence of a prefix ἐ- upon the initial vowel of the verb-stem. We may compare also the Subjunctive forms δύναιμι, τίθημι, &c. (§ 81). Thus the later contraction, as in σκηπτούχος, Λυκούργος, stands in the same relation to the older forms now in question as εἶχον, &c. (with εἶ for εε) to ἦλασα, ὤμοσα, &c.

The primitive Indo-European 'sandhi,'—crasis of the final vowel of one word with the initial vowel of the next,—was generally given up in Greek, and the system of *elision* took its place. In Compounds we constantly find elision of a short final vowel along with the lengthening (which is then a mere survival): as ἐπ-ήρατος, ἀμφ-ήριστος, φθισ-ήνωρ (cp. φθισί-μβροτος). But lengthening does not take place if the vowel is long by position (*e.g.* ἐτερ-αλκής, Ἀλέξ-ανδρος, ἀναιδής), which seems to indicate that the preservation—though not the origin—of the lengthened stem was a matter of rhythm (as in σοφώ-τερος). Other exceptions to the rule of lengthening may be variously explained. In some cases, as Wackernagel suggests (p. 51), an initial short vowel may have been retained from the original formation: as in the ancient Compounds βωτιάνετρα (ἀντιάνετρα, κυδιάνετρα), ἀργιόδοτες, εὐρύσπα, εὐρύαγυια, where the metre stood in the way of lengthening by analogy. More generally it is a mark of lateness: *e.g.* in the forms compounded with πᾶν-, as παν-άποτος, παν-αφήλιξ, παν-αώριος, Παν-αχαιοί, and with Prepositions, as ἐν-αριθμός, ἵπεναντίος (p. 55). Such words as αἰν-αρέτης (Il. 16. 31), λαβρ-αγόρης (Il. 23. 479), ἀν-διεθρος (Il. 13. 761 τοὺς δ' εὖρ' οὐκέτι πάμπαν ἀπήμονας οὐδ' ἀνολέθρους), ἀνάποιον (Il. 1. 99), δυσ-αριστοτόκεια (Il. 18. 54), have all the appearance of being of the poet's own coinage.

On the view here taken the lengthening in ὠλεσίκαρπος and the

similar cases given at the end of the section must be otherwise explained. It is probably of the kind noticed in § 386.

§ 170 (p. 159). Another example of the distributive use of the Singular is Od. 13. 78 ἀνερρίπτουν ἄλα πηδῶ *they threw up the salt sea (each) with his oar-blade*. So in the recurring phrase of the Odyssey ἄλα τύπτον ἐρετμοῖς we should probably read ἐρετμῶ (§ 102), which may be similarly distributive. Or we may take ἐρετμός in a collective sense, *oarage*.

§ 173, 2 (p. 162). For the use of the Dual with a large number which contains the numeral δύο, cp. πεντακοσίαις εἴκοσι δυοῖν δραχμαῖν in an Attic inscription of the 5th century (Meisterhans, p. 45, 4). This is a good parallel to Od. 8. 35, 48 κούρω δύο καὶ πεντήκοντα.

§ 198 (p. 180). Notice under this head the use of ἐπί with a Comparative, Od. 7. 216 οὐ γάρ τι στυγερῇ ἐπὶ γαστέρι κύντερον ἄλλο *nought else is more shameless with (when you have to do with) a hungry belly*, = more shameless than the belly. So Hdt. 4. 118 οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἔσται ἐλαφρότερον.

§ 241 (p. 206). In Il. 17. 155 it is better to take οἰκαδ' ἔμεν with ἐπιπέσεται, leaving the apodosis to be understood: 'if any one will be persuaded to go home (let him do so), &c.' Thus the sentence is of the type exemplified in § 324* b.

§ 245, 1 (p. 212). The Aor. Part. in such a sentence as εἰ ἴδοιμι κατελθόντα seems to be 'timeless,' meaning *if I were to see him go down* (Goodwin, § 148). Mr. Carter, in the article quoted above, ranks ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα as an instance of timeless use in an attributive sense. It should be observed, however, that there is a distinction between a Participle which expresses a *single* action or event (however timeless), and one which has become a mere adjective, as in περιπλομένου ἐνιαυτοῦ, &c. (§ 243, 1). Thus ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα means *to the setting of the sun* (not *to the setting sun*): and so with the other examples given in § 245, 1. It is otherwise perhaps with Od. 1. 24 οἱ μὲν δυσομένου Ὑπερίωνος οἱ δ' ἀνώντος, where the place of sun-set—not of a particular sun-set—is intended.

§ 297 (p. 269). In the Law of Gortyn πρίν κα with the Subj. is repeatedly used after an affirmative principal clause: see Baunack, *Die Inschrift von Gortyn*, p. 82.

§ 324*, b, c. The omission of the principal Verb in passages of this kind (especially when it is suggested by an Infinitive in the protasis) finds a perfect parallel in the Law of Gortyn: iii. 37 κόμιστρα αἶ κα λῆ δόμεν ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνά, ἢ φῆμα ἢ δυώδεκα στατήρας ἢ δυώδεκα στατήρων χρῆος,

πλῖον δὲ μὴ (sc. δότω) *if man or wife choose to give payment for nurture, let him or her give a garment or twelve staters or something of the value of twelve staters, but not more*: cp. the other places quoted by Baunack, *Die Inschrift von Gortyn*, p. 77. This shows that the usage must have been well established in Greek prose from an early period.

§ 338 (p. 309). In Il. 3. 215 most MSS. have εἰ καὶ γένει ὕστερος ἦεν, but ἦ καὶ is found in the two Venetian (AB) and the Townley and Eton MSS. The scholia show that the ancients knew nothing of εἰ, and only doubted between ἦ (in the sense of *if*) and ἦ.

§ 348, 4 (p. 318). In Il. 18. 182 one of the editions of Aristarchus had τίς τὰρ σε (for τίς γάρ σε). Cobet adopts this, and would read τὰρ for γάρ in the similar places Il. 10. 61, 424, Od. 10. 501., 14. 115., 15. 509., 16. 222 (*Misc. Crit.* p. 321). In the two last passages Bekker had already introduced τ' ἄρ into his text.

§ 370 (p. 342). To the instances of shortening before -βρ- should be added ἀβροτάξομεν (Il. 10. 65), which is a derivative verb from the stem which we have in the two forms ἀμαρ- and ἀ(μ)βροτ- (cp. ἡμβροτον). The appearance of πο instead of πα (for γ) is Æolic.

§ 405 (p. 382). A parallel to the Naxian ΑΨΥΤΟ has now been found in the form ΑΨΥΤΑΡ on an Attic inscription of the VIth cent. B. C. (see J. van Leeuwen, *Mnemos.* xix. 21). Further instances of Chalcidian F (Φοικέων, φαφοί?) are given by Roberts, *Epigraphy*, p. 204.

§ 69 (p. 62). In an article on the Augment in Homer in the last number of the *Journal of Philology* (xix. p. 211 ff.), Mr. Arthur Platt has shown that, in the case of the Aorist, the choice between the augmented and the unaugmented form is largely determined by the sense in which the tense is used. In the common historical or narrative use the augment is often wanting; but in the uses which we may call *non-narrative*—the use for the *immediate past* (§ 76), and the *gnomic* use (§ 78)—the augmented form prevails. With the gnomic use the rule appears to be especially strict. This is obviously a valuable extension and generalisation of the facts observed by Koch. In the case of the Imperfect there seems to be a preference for unaugmented forms in continuous narrative; but the difference is much less marked. Mr. Platt gives some good reasons for believing that the number of unaugmented forms was originally greater than it is in our text. In this we find a fresh example of the modernising process to which the poems were subjected from a very early time.

INDEX I.

OF HOMERIC FORMS.

N.B. The figures refer to the *sections*.

Compound verbs are not indexed if the same form of the simple verb occurs.

ἀάσατο }
ἀάσθη } 44, 384 (1).
ἀβλής 125 (4), 128 (3).
ἀβροτάξομεν App. p.
402.
ἀβρότη 370.
ἀγάασθε 51 (2), 55 β,
384 (1).
Ἀγάθων 129.
ἀγαύμενος 51 (2).
ἀγακλῆος 105 (5).
ἄγαμαι 11.
ἀγάννιφος 371.
ἀγάσσεσθαι 63.
ἀγανός 396.
ἀγγελίης 116 (2).
ἀγείρομεν 80.
ἀγελείη 124 d.
ἀγέροντο 33.
ἀγηγέρατο 22 (8), 23.
ἀγκάς 106 (3), 110.
ἀγλαΐεσθαι 63, 64.
ἄγνυμι 17, 390.
ἄγνώς 125.
ἀγοράασθε 386.
ἀγριοο 98.
ἀγρόμενοι 31 (5), 33.
ἀγρότερος 122.
ἀγνυαί 111, 114.
ἄγχε 30.
ἀγχιμαχος 124 d.
ἄγχι 110.
ἀγχιμόλον 128 (1).
Ἀγχίσις 116 (2).

ἀγχιστίνας 117.
ἀγχοῦ 110.
ἄγω 30, 70, 72, App. p.
398.
ἀγωγή 114.
ἀγών 114.
ἀδάμας 114, 243 (1).
ἀδδεές 371.
ἀδελφεός 98.
ἀδῆκώς 22 (9), 26, 28.
ἄδην 110, 136 (2).
ἀδμής 125 (4).
ἀεί 384 (1).
ἀείδω 384 (1).
ἀεικιῶ 63, 64.
ἀείρω 32.
ἄεσι 12.
ἀέκητι 110.
ἀέκων (ἄκων) 378.
ἀελλόπος 124 a.
ἀερσίποδες 124 c.
ἄεσα 34, 39 (2), 384 (1).
ἀεσιφρων 124 c.
ἄζαλέος 118.
ἄη, ἄει 18.
ἄηδών 118.
ἄημι 11, 12.
ἄηναι 85.
ἄήρ 114, 384 (1), App.
F (4).
ἀθάνατος 386.
ἀθλοφόρος 378 g, 396.
αἷ, see εἰ.
αἴγεσι 102.

Αἰγέυς 129.
αἰγι- 124 b.
Αἴγισθος 129.
Αἰγυπτιή 378 n.
αἰδέο 5.
αἰδέο 32.
αἰδέσεται 63.
αἰδετο 31 (3), 32.
Ἀϊδης 107, 116 (2), 384
(1).
αἰδόμενος 32.
αἰδώς 114.
αἶεις 30.
αἰέν 99.
αἰθήρ 114.
Αἰθιοπῆας 107 (5), 124 b.
αἰθόμενος 31 (3), 32.
αἴθουσα 243 (1).
αἴθοψ 124 d.
αἰκῶς 125 (2).
αἰναρέτη 92.
Αἰνείας 95, 116 (2), 129,
App. F (4).
αἴνυμαι 17.
Αἰόλοο 98.
αἶον 31 (3), 32, 384 (1).
αἶρεο 5, 105 (4), 378 b.
αἵσχιον }
αἰσχιστος } 121.
αἰχμάσσουσι 63.
αἰχμητά 96.
αἰψα 110.
αἰψηρός 120.
ἀκάκητα 96.

ἀκαλαρρείτης 124 *f*.
 ἀκάμας 114, 243 (1).
 ἀκάματος 386.
 ἀκαχέιατο App. C (3).
 ἀκάχημαι 22 (9), 23 (3).
 ἀκαχήμενος } 25, 89,
 ἀκάχησθαι } App. F (2).
 ἀκαχμένος 22 (1).
 ἀκειόμενος 51 (3).
 ἀκερσεκόμης 124 *d*.
 ἄκην 110.
 ἀκηχέδαται 24 (3, 4), 53.
 ἀκηχεμένος 23 (3).
 ἀκλέα, ἀκλέες 105 (4).
 ἀκλειῶς } 105(5), App. C.
 ἀκληεῖς }
 ἀκμήτες 125 (4).
 ἀκομιστή 384 (1).
 ἀκουάζομαι App. p. 397.
 ἀκούω 143 (3), App. p.
 396.
 ἀκραής 384 (1).
 ἄκρις 114.
 ἀκταῖς 102.
 * Ἀκτωρ 129.
 ἀκωκή 114.
 ἄκων 114.
 ἀλάλῃμαι 22 (9), 23 (3).
 ἀλάλῃσθαι, 25, 89, App.
 F (2).
 ἀλαλκε 36 (4).
 ἀλαλύκτημαι 22 (9).
 ἀλασκοπιή 125 (7).
 ἀλγιον }
 ἀλγιστος } 121.
 ἀλέαιτο, ἀλέασθαι, 15,
 384 (1).
 ἀλεγεινός 118.
 ἀλειφαρ 107 (2).
 ἀλειφε 29 (2).
 ἀλεξάνεμος 124 *d*.
 ἀλεξίκακος 124 *b*.
 ἀλεσσαν 39 (2).
 ἄλειται 80.
 ἀλευσασθαι 396.
 ἀλέυεται 80.

ἀλεωρή 120.
 ἄλῃται 31 (1).
 * Ἀλθαμίνης 124 *b*.
 ἄλθετο 31 (1), 32.
 ἄλι- 124 *b*.
 ἄλιας 384 (1).
 ἄλις 110, 390.
 ἄλιτέσθαι 31 (3).
 ἄλιτήμενος 19.
 * Ἀλκάθοος 124 *f*.
 ἄλκι 107 (1).
 ἄλκι- 124 *b*.
 ἄλλά (use) 336.
 ἄλλοειδέα 125 (2), 396.
 ἄλλυδις 109, 110, App.
 F (2).
 ἄλους 13.
 ἄλῶω 55.
 ἄλσο, ἄλτο 40, App. F
 (2).
 ἄλυσκάζω App. p. 397.
 ἄλφεσίβοιος 124 *c*.
 ἄλφοι 31 (1), 32.
 ἄλφοιν (3 Pl. Opt.) 83.
 ἀλώμεναι } 13, 20, 42,
 ἀλῶναι } 390.
 ἀλῶω 80.
 ἄμα 110.
 ἄμαξα App. F (2).
 ἄμαρτε 31 (5), 32.
 ἄμαρτοσιής 126.
 ἄματροχιή 125 (7).
 ἄμαχητή 110.
 ἄμειβε 29 (2), 32.
 ἄμείβοντες 243 (1).
 ἄμελγε 29 (4), 32.
 ἄμεναι 11.
 ἄμμε 97, 100.
 ἄμμι(ν) 102, App. F (2).
 ἄμογητή 110.
 ἄμόθεν App. F (2).
 ἄμοιβήδης 110.
 ἄμπεπαλῶν 36 (1).
 ἄμπνευ 31 (4), 32.
 ἄμπνύνθη 44.
 ἄμπνῦτο 13, 32.
 ἄμυδις 109, App. F (2).
 * Ἀμύντωρ 129.
 ἄμφαδίην 110.
 ἄμφηρεφής 125 (8).
 ἄμφήριστος 125 (8).
 ἄμφί 180, 181-184.
 ἄμφιάλος 397.
 * Ἀμφιάραος App. F (4).
 ἄμφιαχῦα 23 (5), 28.
 ἄμφίεπον 397.
 ἄμφίς 110, 228.
 ἄν (use) 362-365, App.
 F (5).
 ἀνά, ἀνα 180, 180*, 209,
 210.
 ἀναβέβρυχε 25 (3).
 ἀναβῆ 81.
 ἀναβροχέν 42.
 ἀναιμωτί 110.
 ἀνακήκε 51 (1).
 ἀνάκτεσι 102.
 ἀνάλκιδα, ἀναλκιν 97.
 ἀναξ 390.
 ἀνάσσω.(c. Gen.) 151 *f*.
 ἀναψύχειν 29.
 ἀνδάνω 47, 391.
 ἀνδρακάς 109.
 ἀνδραπόδεσσι 107 (1),
 124 *a*.
 ἀνδρεΐφόντης 370.
 ἀνδροκτασίη 125 (7).
 ἀνδρότης 370.
 ἀνδροφόνος 124 *a*.
 ἀνέκραγον 31 (1).
 ἀνέπαλτο 40.
 ἄνεται 47.
 ἀνεψιόο 98.
 ἀνέφγον 67.
 ἀνήη 80.
 ἀνήκεστος 125 (8).
 ἀνήμελκτος 125 (8).
 ἀνήνοθε 22 (8), 27, 68.
 ἀνήροτος 125 (8).
 ἀνιδρωτή 110.
 ἀνιείς 18.
 ἀνιηρέστερος 121.

ἀνουτηγί 110.
 ἀντεσθαι 32.
 ἀτην 110.
 ἀντί 180, 226.
 ἀντιάνειρα App. p. 400.
 ἀντιάσεις 63.
 ἀντιάσθητον 82.
 Ἀντίκλεια 378 g.
 ἀντικρύ 110.
 ἀντιώω 63.
 ἀντίσχεσθε 226.
 Ἀντιφατή 107 (5).
 ἀντόμενος 31 (1), 32.
 ἀνύσσεσθαι 63.
 ἀνύω 18, 63.
 ἄνω 110.
 ἄνωγα 21 (1), 23, 27.
 ἀνώγει }
 ἀνώγοιμι } 27, 68.
 ἄνωγον }
 ἀνωϊστί 110.
 ἀνωϊστος 125 (8).
 ἄνωχθι 28.
 ἀξέμεναι } 41.
 ἄξετε }
 ἄορ 114.
 ἀοσσητήρ 114.
 ἄπαξ 110.
 ἀπαφίσκει 48.
 ἀπειλήτην 19.
 ἀπειπέμεν 396.
 ἀπειρών 114.
 ἀπερείσιος 384 (2).
 ἀπεχθάνει 47.
 ἀπηλεγέως 125 (8).
 ἀπηύρα 13.
 ἄπο 180, 180*, 224.
 ἀποδίδωμαι 386.
 ἀποδρύφοι 30.
 ἀπόρσε 39 (3).
 ἀποθείομαι 80.
 ἀπόθωμαι 88.
 ἀπομόργνυ 17.
 ἀπονέεσθαι 386.
 ἀπόνητο 13.
 ἀποπρό 227.

ἀπορρώξ 128.
 ἀπούρας 13, 396. App.
 F (2).
 ἀπουρίσσουνσι 63.
 ἀποφθίμην 83 (1).
 ἀπριάτην 110.
 ἄπτω 46.
 ἄρα 110, (use) 347.
 ἀραιός 392.
 ἀράρισκε 48.
 ἀραρυία 22 (1), 23.
 ἀργαλέος 118.
 ἀργεννός 118, App. F
 (3).
 ἀργέτα, ἀργήτα 114.
 ἀργι- 124 δ.
 ἀργιόδοντες 124 δ, App.
 p. 400.
 ἀρείων 121.
 ἄρες 107.
 ἀρεσσόμεθα 63.
 ἄρετο 31 (1).
 ἀρήγει 29 (1).
 ἀρη- 124 f, 125 (6).
 ἀρήμεναι 19.
 ἀρημένος 26 (5).
 ἄρην 97, 107 (5).
 ἄρρη 22 (1), 23, 28.
 ἀρήρη 80.
 ἀρηρόμενος 23.
 ἀρηρώς 26.
 ἀριστερός 121.
 ἀρκέσει 63.
 ἀρματοπηγός 124 α.
 ἀρματοροχή 128.
 ἄρμενος 40.
 ἀρμόζω 53.
 ἀρνός 106 (2), 390.
 ἀρνύσθην 17.
 ἀρώσω 55.
 ἀρπάξω 63.
 ἀρπυια 114.
 ἄρρηκτος 371.
 ἄρσαι 39 (3).
 ἀρτίπος 124 δ.
 ἀρχε- 124 α.

ἄρχει 30.
 ἄσαμεν 378 g.
 ἄσε, ἄσατο 378 g.
 Ἀσκληπιοῦ 98, 243 (1).
 ἄσμενος 40, 86.
 ἄσσα 108 (2).
 ἄσσαν 121.
 ἄσσοτέρω 110, 121.
 ἀστράπτει 46.
 ἄστν 390.
 ἀστνυβοώτης 55.
 ἀταλάφρων 124 f.
 ἀτάρ (use) 336.
 ἄτη 378 g.
 ἀτιμῆ 384 (1).
 ἄτρεϊδη 92.
 ἀτρέμα(s) 110.
 ἄττα 92.
 αἰ (use) 337.
 Αἰγείας 95, 116 (2), 129.
 αἰε 31 (4), 32.
 αἰένων 396.
 αἴη 31 (4), 32.
 αἰαχοι 396, App. F.
 αἰτάρ (use) 336.
 αἰτε (use) 337.
 αἰτις 109.
 αἰτμήν 114, App. p. 399.
 αἰτόδιον App. F (2).
 αἰτονυχεί 110.
 αἰτός (use) 252.
 αἰτοῦ 110.
 αἰτόφι 157.
 αἰτῶς 111.
 ἀφή 80, 384.
 ἀφίκεσθον (3 Du.) 5.
 ἀφύζων 63.
 ἀφυσσάμενος 63.
 Ἀχαιϊκός 117.
 ἄχνυναι 17.
 ἄχομαι 30.
 ἄχος 114.
 ἄχρη(s) 110.
 ἄωρο 25 (1).
 βαθέης 384 (1).

βάλοισθα 5.
 βαμβαίνων 61.
 βαρβίστος 121.
 βασιλεύτερος 121, 122.
 βάσκε 48.
 βάτην 13.
 βεβάσσι 7.
 βεβαρηότα 22 (9), 28.
 βέβασαν 7, 68.
 βεβαῶτα 26 (1).
 βέβηκα 22 (9).
 βεβήκει 68.
 βεβίηκε 22 (9).
 βέβληαι 5.
 βεβλήται 5.
 βεβλήκει 22 (7), 28.
 βεβλήκοι 27, 83.
 βέβληται 22 (9).
 βεβολήατο 28.
 βέβουλα 22 (3).
 βέβριθε 22 (6).
 βεβριθυία 26 (3).
 βέβρυχε 28.
 βεβρώθοις 22 (10), 27, 83.
 βεβρωκώς 22 (9), 26 (4), 28.
 βεβρώσεται 22 (9), 65.
 βεβῶσα 26 (3), 378 g.
 βείομαι, βέομαι 80, 384 (1).
 βείω (βήω) 80, App. C.
 βέλτερος 121.
 βένθος 114.
 βήμεναι 13.
 βήσομεν 80.
 βήω 80.
 Βιάνωρ App. F (4).
 βιβάς 16.
 βιβάντα, βιβῶσα 18.
 βιώναι 13, 42.
 βιώτω 13, 20.
 βλάβεται 30.
 βλάπτει 46.
 βλήεται 80, 326 (1).
 βλήτο 13, 14.
 βλοσυρῶπις 116.

βοηλασίη 125 (7), (8).
 βόλεσθε, βόλεται 30.
 Βορέας 116 (2).
 Βορέω 98.
 βόσκει 48.
 βούβρωστις 125.
 βουγάιος App. F (4).
 βουλεύεσθα 5.
 βουλεύσωμεν 82.
 βουλυτός 125.
 βουπλήξ 125, 128.
 βοῦς 100.
 βοῶπις 116 (3), 128 (3).
 βράσσων 121.
 βρέμει 29 (5).
 βρίθον 29 (4).
 βῶν 97, 106 (2).
 βῶσι 81.
 βωτιάνεира 124 c, App. p. 400.

γαιήοχος 124 a.
 γαίωv 51 (2).
 γαμέσσεται 63, 367 (2).
 γαμψῶνυξ 124 c, 125 (8).
 γάννται 17.
 γανύσσεται 63.
 γάρ 348: cp. 257 (1), 259 (3), 265, 365 (3).
 γε 354: cp. 257 (2).
 γεγάσι 7.
 γέγαμεν 22 (7).
 γεγαῶτας 26 (1).
 γέγηθε 22 (1), 28.
 γέγονε 22 (7), 28.
 γέγωνε 22 (1), 28.
 γεγωνεῖν } 27.
 γεγωνέμεν }
 γέλος App. F (3).
 γέλως 107 n.
 γελῶν 55.
 γενέσθαι 31 (6).
 γέντο 40.
 γένυσσι 102.
 γέρα 105 (4).
 γεραίτερος 121.

γέρων 114, 243 (1).
 γηράς 20, 42.
 γήρας 114.
 γηροκόμος 124 a.
 γίγνομαι 35.
 γιγνώσκω 48.
 γλαυκῶπις 128 (3).
 γλῆνος 114.
 γνῶ, γνῶμεν 81.
 γνῶσι 81.
 γνώτην 13.
 γνώω, γνώομεν 80.
 γοάοιεν 55 (6).
 γοήμεναι 19.
 γόνυ 107 (2).
 γόον 32.
 γονάσσομαι 63.
 γράφω 30, 70.
 γρηῖ 107 (5).
 δάδων 111.
 δαέρων 106 (1).
 δαήρ App. F (4).
 δαήσεται 65.
 δάηται 31 (1), (6), 32.
 δαῖ 105 (4).
 δαιδάλλω 61.
 δαϊκτάμενος 124 f, 125 (6).
 δαῖνυ 5, 17.
 δαινύατο 83 (1).
 δαινύη (Subj.) 18, 80.
 δαίνυσαι 5.
 δαινῦτο 83 (1).
 δαῖφρων 124 b.
 δαίω 51 (2).
 δακέειν 31 (6).
 δάκρυ 114.
 δακρυόφι 154.
 δακρυχέων 125 (6).
 δαμᾶ 63.
 δάμνασαι, δαμᾶ 5, 18.
 δάμνημι 17.
 δαμόω 63.
 δάσσονται 63.
 δαῶμεν 81.

δέ (use) 257 (1), 259 (1), 333-335.
 δέατο 11.
 δέγγενος 23 (5).
 δεδάσθαι 36 η.
 δέδαεν 36 (5).
 δεδάηκε 22 (9).
 δεδαηκώς 26 (4).
 δεδαίεται 22 (1).
 δεδάκρυσται 28.
 δέδασται 22 (1).
 δεδαώς 22 (7).
 δέδεγμαι 22 (8), 28.
 δεδειπνῆκει 22 (9).
 δεδέξομαι 65.
 δέδηκε 22 (1), 28.
 δεδήει 68.
 δεδίασι 7.
 δέδορκε 22 (6), 28.
 δέδοται 22 (3).
 δεδουπότος 22 (5), 26 (5).
 δέδρομε 22 (4).
 δέδυκε 22 (9).
 δειδέχεται 23 (6), 24 (2), (3), 28.
 δειδία 23 (2), 28, 394.
 δειδίε (Pipf.) 27, 68.
 δειδισαν 7.
 δειδίσσεσθαι 8, 61.
 δειδοικα 22 (9), 23 (2).
 δειδω 22 (4), 27, 372.
 δεικνύσι 5, 87 (2).
 δεινός 372, 394.
 δείους 105 (5), App. C.
 δέισητε 82.
 δέκτο 40.
 δέμας 136 (2).
 δέμον 29 (5).
 δενδύλων 61.
 δεξιτερῆφι(ν) 155, 157.
 δεξιτερός 121.
 δέξο 40.
 δέομαι 384 (1).
 δέος 394.
 δέπα 105 (4).

δέρκομαι 29 (4).
 δέρον 29 (4).
 δέσματα 107 (2).
 δεύομαι 384 (1), 396.
 δεύατος 121.
 δέχεται 23 (5).
 δέχθαι 40.
 δέχομαι 29 (6), 143 (2).
 δῆ (use) 350, 378.
 δῆεις 80.
 δηθά 394.
 δῆϊος 384 (1), App. F (4).
 δηϊόφειν } 55 c.
 δηϊώντο }
 Δηϊφόβος 124 b.
 δηλήσεται 82.
 Δημήτηρ 129.
 δήμοο 98, 368.
 δῆν 371, 394.
 δηρόν 110, 394.
 διά 180, 214-216, 386.
 διάθωμαι 88.
 διαπρό 227.
 διαφθέρσει 63.
 διδασκέμεν 48.
 δίδη 16.
 διδοίς, διδοί 18.
 διδοίσθα 5.
 δίδου 18.
 διδοῦναι 85.
 διδοῦσι 5, 87 (2).
 δίδωθι 5, 16.
 διδώσομεν 63.
 διέ 31 (3), 32 (1).
 δειπε 396.
 διέκριθεν 43.
 διενται 11, 31 (3).
 διέξ 227.
 διέσθαι 31 (3).
 διέτμαγεν 42.
 διέτμαγον 31 (1).
 διέφθορας 22 (6), 23, 28.
 δίξε 35.
 δίξῃαι 5, 16.
 δικόσιοι 125 (8).

διηρκής 125 (8).
 διῦ- 124 f.
 δικασπόλος 124 f.
 διογενής 124 a.
 Διόθεν 109, 159.
 Δίοιτο 31 (3), 83.
 Διον 31 (3).
 Διόνυσος 129.
 Δίος 114.
 δίπτυχα 107 (1).
 διψάων 19, 55 (8), App. F (4).
 διώκειν 29, 45, App. p. 397.
 διώκετον (3 Du.) 5.
 διώμαι 31 (3).
 δμητός 14.
 δμῶων 111.
 δοιά 133.
 δολιχῆρετος 125 (8).
 Δῶλων 129.
 δόμεν 85.
 δόρν 107 (2).
 δός 5.
 δοτήρ 114.
 δοῦναι 85.
 δουρηκεές 125 (8).
 δουρι- 124 f.
 δουροδόκη 124 a.
 δραινεις 59.
 δράκων 243 (1).
 δρίον 29 (4).
 δρυμά 99*.
 δρώσι 55 a.
 δύν (Opt.) 83 (1).
 δῦθι 13.
 δύνειναι, δύναι 13, 85.
 δυναμένοιο 386.
 δύναμις 114.
 δύνασαι 5, 11, 386.
 δυνάσθη 44.
 δύνε 47.
 δύνῃαι 81, 87 (3).
 δύνωμαι 87 (3).
 δύο, δύω 130 (2).
 δυσηλεγής 125 (8).

δυσκλέα 105 (4).
 δυσόμενος 41.
 δῶ 51 (4), (Subj.) 80.
 δυνάδεκα 130 (2).
 δῶ, δῶς, &c. 81.
 δῶη, δῶσι 80, 82.
 δώομεν 80.
 δώτωρ 114.
 ε, εε 97.
 εα 12.
 εαγε 22 (1), App. F (4).
 εάγη 42, 67.
 εαδότα 22 (1), 26 (2),
 App. F (4).
 εάλη 42, 67, 390.
 εαξε 67.
 εαρ 390.
 εασι 5.
 εάφθη 46 n.
 εβαλον 31 (5).
 εβαν 5.
 εβδόματος 121.
 εβην 13.
 εβήσето 41.
 εβήτην 13.
 εβλαβεν 42.
 εβόλοντο 30.
 εβραχε 31 (5).
 εγγύς 110.
 εγδούπησαν 67.
 εγέγωνε 27, 68.
 εγημα 39 (3).
 εγήρα 13, 20.
 εγνων 13, 14.
 εγρεκύδοιμος 124 d.
 εγρετο 31 (5), 33.
 εγρήγορα 22 (7), 23.
 εγρηγόρθασι 22 (10), 24.
 εγρήγορθε 25 (1).
 εγρηγορτί 110.
 εγροίτο 33.
 εγχείη 29 (3).
 εγχεσίμωρος 124 f.
 εδάη 42, 44.
 εδάμασσα 39 (2).

εδάμη 42.
 εδάμνα 18.
 εθάσαστο 39 (1).
 εδδειςε, εδειςε 39, 67,
 371, 394.
 εδέγμην 23 (5), 40.
 εδει 29 (6).
 εδείδιμεν, εδείδισαν 68.
 εδήδαται (-εται) 27.
 εδηδώς 22 (2), 25, 28.
 εδιδον 5.
 εδίδους, -ου 18.
 εδμεναι 11.
 εδομαι 80.
 εδρακον 31 (5).
 εδραμον 31 (5).
 εδυ, εδυτε 13.
 εδύν (3 Pl.) 5.
 εδύσето 41.
 εδωδή 114.
 εδωκα, εδωκαν 7, 15.
 εεικοσάβοιος 130.
 εειπα 37.
 εειπον 36 (6), 67, 72.
 εεισάμενος 67.
 εείσαστο 39, 400.
 εέλδωρ 114* (8) d.
 εελμένος 22 (6), 23 (1),
 25 (2), 390.
 εέργει 29 (4), App. F
 (1).
 εέργνυ 17.
 εερμένος 22 (6), 23 (1),
 25 (2).
 εέσαστο 67.
 εεστο 23 (5).
 εζετο 31 (7).
 εζεугμέναι 22 (5), 23 (2),
 25 (2).
 εηκα 15, 67.
 εην 12.
 εήνδανε 67.
 εηξα App. p. 398.
 εήος 94 (2).
 εης, εη 80.
 εησθα 5, 12.

εησι 80, 82.
 εθανε 31 (6).
 εέλει 29 (4).
 εέλησθα 5.
 εεμεν, εεσαν 15.
 εθεν 109, App. F (3).
 εθηκα, εθηκαν 7, 15.
 εθλασε 39 (1).
 εθνος 392.
 εθορον 31 (5).
 εθος 391.
 εθων 31 (2), 243 (1).
 ει (use) 291-295, 311-
 314, 318-321, 324*.
 εια 67.
 ειарινός 386, 390, 396.
 ειатаи 11, App. C (3).
 ειато (Feσ-) 23 (5).
 ειβει 29 (2).
 ειδαρ 107 (2), 114.
 ειδείη 83 (1).
 ειδεται 29 (2).
 ειδέω, ειδής, &c. 80.
 ειδομεν, ειδετε 80.
 ειδον 67, 72, 390.
 ειδος 390.
 ειδυία 26.
 ειδω, ειδής, &c. 80.
 ειδώς 26 (2).
 εικελος 390.
 εικοσι 390.
 εικτον, εικτην 22 (4), 68.
 ειкуία 22 (4), 26 (3).
 ειкуω 29 (2), 390.
 ειкуός 26 (2).
 ειлар 114.
 ειλήλουθα 22 (5).
 ειλήλουθμεν 25 (1).
 ειλίποδες 124 b.
 ειλον 31 (5), 67.
 ειλυτο 23 (1), 390.
 ειλυφάω App. p. 397.
 ειλύω 390, 396.
 ειλω 390.
 ειμα 390.
 ειμαι 23 (5), 390.

εἴματα 22 (6), 23 (2).
 εἰμέν 12.
 εἶμεν 67.
 εἰμένος 23.
 εἰμί 11, 12, 70.
 εἶμι 11, 12, 70.
 εἶν 384 (2).
 εἶναι 12.
 εἶνατος 130 (5), 384 (2).
 εἵνεκα 384 (2).
 εἶο 98.
 εἰοικυία 26 (3), 384 (1).
 εἶπα 37.
 εἰπέ 87 (4).
 εἰπεῖν 390.
 εἴπετο 67.
 εἴπησθα 5.
 εἴρεσίη 386.
 εἰρήσεται 65.
 εἴρηται 22 (9), 23 (2).
 εἰροκόμος 124 *a*.
 εἰρύαται 5, 23, 28.
 εἶρυσσα 67, 378 *g*, 396.
 εἶρω 390.
 εἶς 222.
 εἷς, εἴς, ἐσσί 5, 12.
 εἶσαν 67.
 εἰσανιδῶν 396 *n*.
 εἶσατο 67.
 εἶσθα 5, 12.
 εἶσι 12.
 εἶσκω 48, 390.
 εἶσομαι 63.
 εἶσω 110, 228.
 εἶται 23 (5).
 εἶχον 67.
 εἶωθε 22 (2), 23 (2), 384 (1).
 εἰκάντο 17.
 ἔκαμον 31 (6).
 ἐκάπυσσε 39 (2).
 ἐκάς 110, 390.
 ἐκαστέρω } 110.
 ἐκαστάτω }
 ἔκαστος 390.
 ἐκατηβόλος 124 *a*.

ἔκατος 129, 390.
 ἐκεγάτην 68.
 ἐκδύμεν 83 (1).
 ἐκείθι 109.
 ἐκέκλετο 36 (4).
 ἔκερσε 39 (3).
 ἐκεύθανον 47.
 ἔκη 15, App. C (3).
 ἐκῆλος 390.
 ἔκητι 110, 390.
 ἐκίδνατο 370.
 ἔκιον 31 (3), 32.
 ἐκίρνα 18.
 ἐκατιδῶν 396 *n*.
 ἐκλέλαθον 36 (1).
 ἔκλεο 5.
 ἐκλίθη } 43.
 ἐκλίνθη }
 ἔκλυον 18, 31 (4), 32.
 ἔκλων 51.
 ἔκμολε 31 (5).
 ἐκορέσασατο 39 (2).
 ἐκπέποται 22 (3).
 ἐκρέμω 5, 11.
 ἔκτα, ἔκταμεν, ἔκταν 5, 13.
 ἔκταθεν 43.
 ἔκτανον 31 (6).
 ἔκτατο 13.
 ἐκτῆσθαι 23 (2).
 ἐκτήσω 5.
 ἔκτυπε 31 (4).
 ἔκτωρ 129.
 ἐκυρός 391.
 ἐκῶν 243 (1), 390.
 ἐλάαν 63.
 ἐλάγχανον 47.
 ἐλάσσω 121.
 ἐλαύνω 47.
 ἐλαφιβόλος 124 *a*.
 ἐλαχον 31 (6).
 ἐλεγχείες 116.
 ἐλέγχει 29 (5).
 ἐλέγχιστος 121.
 ἔλεκτο 40.
 ἐλέλικτο 40, 53, 390.

ἐλέχθην 44.
 ἐλεόθρεπτος 124 *a*.
 ἐληλάδατ' 24 (4).
 ἐλήλათαι 23 (3).
 ἐλήλυθα 25.
 ἐλθέ 87 (4).
 ἐλίσσω 53, 390.
 ἐλκεσίπεπλος 124 *c*, 126.
 ἐλκεχίτωνες 124 *d*, 126.
 ἐλκυστάζω 60.
 ἔλκω 29 (4), 393.
 ἔλλαβε 31 (1), 67.
 Ἑλλήσποντος 124 *f*.
 ἐλλισάμην 39 (1), 371.
 ἔλον 31 (5), 393.
 ἔλος 393.
 ἐλῶ 63.
 ἔλπομαι 29 (4), 390.
 ἐλπωρή 120.
 ἔλσαν 39 (3), 390.
 ἔλων 51.
 ἔλωρ 114* (8) *d*.
 ἔμαρπτε 46.
 ἐμέ 97.
 ἐμέθεν 109, App. F (3).
 ἐμείο 98.
 ἐμέμηκον 27, 68.
 ἔμεν, ἔμεναι 12, 85.
 ἐμέο, ἐμεῦ 98, 378* *e*.
 ἐμέω 390.
 ἐμίγη 42.
 ἔμικτο 40.
 ἐμισγέσκοντο 69.
 ἐμίχθη 44.
 ἔμμαθε 67.
 ἔμμεν, ἔμμεναι 12, 85.
 ἔμμορε 22 (6), 23, 28, 371, App. F (2), (3).
 ἔμπαιος 384 (1).
 ἐμπίπληθι 5, 16.
 ἐμπυριβήτης 124 *f*.
 ἐνατος 130 (5).
 ἐνδίσσαν 11, 31 (3), 32.
 ἐνείκαι, ἐνείκαμεν, ἐνείκαν 15, 37.
 ἐνεικέμεν 37.

ἐννήκοντα 130 (5).
 ἐνένιπε App. p. 397.
 ἐνεροι 121.
 ἐνέρτερος 121.
 ἐνήκαμεν 15.
 ἐνι 180, 180*, 220.
 ἐνιπλήξωμεν 82.
 ἐνιπτε 46.
 ἐνισπε, ἐνίσπες 5, 88.
 ἐνισπήσω 14.
 ἐνίσσω 46.
 ἐννεον 29 (3), 67, 371.
 ἐννεπε 29 (6).
 ἐννώρος 130 (5).
 ἐννήμαρ 130 (5), App. F (3).
 ἐννοσίγαιος 124 c, App. F (3).
 ἐννυμι 17, 390.
 ἐνοσίχθων 124 c.
 ἐνταυθοῖ 109.
 ἐντεσιεργός 124 f.
 ἐντυπᾶς 110.
 ἐνωπα 107 (2).
 ἐξ 222.
 ἐξ 391.
 ἐξάετες 130.
 ἐξέπτῃ 13.
 ἐξεσύθη 43.
 ἐξήλατος 125 (8).
 ἐξημοιβός 125 (8).
 ἐξήπαφε 36 (1).
 ἔξω 110.
 ἔο, &c. 98, 253, 391.
 ἔοι, ἔοις 29 (6), 83.
 ἔοικα 22 (4), 23, 390.
 εἰοίκεσαν 68.
 εἰοικώς, εἰοικῦα 26 (2).
 ἔολπα 22 (6), 23, 28.
 ἔον, ἔοι 29 (6).
 ἔοργα 22 (6), 23, 28.
 εἰοργῶς 26 (2).
 εἰός (use) 254, 255.
 εἰοῦ (= ἔο) 98.
 ἔπαγῃ 42.
 ἔπαθον 31 (6).

ἐπάλξεσι 102.
 ἔπαλτο, ἐπάλμενος 40.
 ἐπαμοιβᾶς 109.
 ἐπασσύτεροι 121.
 ἐπαυρεῖν 31 (4).
 ἐπαυρίσκονται 48.
 ἐπεῖ (use) 296, 309.
 ἐπενήροθε 22 (8), 68.
 ἐπέοικε 396.
 ἐπέπιθμεν 22 (4), 68.
 ἐπέπληγον 27, 68.
 ἐπέπλως 13, 20.
 ἔπερσε 39 (3), 40.
 ἐπεσβολή 125 (7).
 ἔπεσον 41.
 ἔπεται 29 (6).
 ἐπέτειλα 39 (3).
 ἔπεφνε 36 (5).
 ἐπέφραδε 36 (2).
 ἐπεφράσω 5.
 ἐπέφυκον 68.
 ἐπήν (use) 363 (4).
 ἔπηξα 40.
 ἐπήρατος 125 (8).
 ἔπι 180, App. p. 401.
 ἐπιᾶλμενος 397.
 ἐπιβησόμενος 41, 244.
 ἐπιβήτων 81.
 ἐπιβλής 125 (4).
 ἐπιδέδρομε 22 (6).
 ἐπιδόντα 396.
 ἐπιδώμεθα 81.
 ἐπικίδνεται 370.
 ἐπίθοντο 31 (3).
 ἐπίκλησιν 135.
 ἐπιμέμφομαι 29 (5).
 ἐπίμιξ 110.
 ἔπιον 31 (3).
 ἐπιπλόμενος 33.
 ἐπιπλώς 13, 20.
 ἐπιπτέσθαι 31 (7).
 ἐπισπέσθαι 31 (7), 36 (6).
 ἐπισπόμενος 36 (6).
 ἐπίστατο 87 (3).
 ἐπίσταμαι 11.
 ἐπίστηται 81, 87 (3), 280.

ἐπισχοίης 83.
 ἐπιτετράφαται 24.
 ἐπίτονος 386.
 ἔπλε, ἔπλετο 31 (5), 33, 78.
 ἐπλήγη 42.
 ἔπορον 31 (5).
 ἔπος 136 (3), 390.
 ἐπράθομεν 31 (5).
 ἔπρεπε 29 (4).
 ἔπτаре 31 (5).
 ἔπτατο 13.
 ἔπταχα 109.
 ἐπώχато 22 (2), 23.
 ἐράασθε 51 (3).
 ἔραμαι 11.
 ἔργον 136 (3), 390.
 ἐρεβενός 118, App. F (3).
 Ἐρέβους 105 (3).
 ἔριδε 29 (2).
 ἐρεικόμενος 29 (2).
 ἐρείομεν 80.
 ἔρειπε 29 (2).
 ἐρείπια 114.
 ἐρείσθη 44.
 ἐρέριπτο 23, 25.
 ἐρέσθαι 31 (5).
 ἐρετμόν 114, App. p. 398.
 ἐρεύγεται 29 (3).
 ἐρεύθων 29 (3).
 ἐρέω 309.
 ἐρηρέδαται 23, 24.
 ἐρήριπε 23.
 ἔριδα, ἔριν 97.
 ἐρίρηας, ἐρίρηες 107.
 ἐριούνης 125 (8).
 Ἐρμείας 92, 95, 116, 129, App. F (4).
 ἔρος 107.
 ἔρπει 29 (4).
 ἐρπύζω 53.
 ἐρράδαται 22 (1), 24.
 ἔρρεεν 67.
 ἔρρεξε 67, 395.
 ἔρρηκται 23, 25.

ἔρηξα 67, 395.
 ἔρριγα 22 (6), 28.
 ἔρριγησε 67, 395.
 ἔρριγησι 80, 82.
 ἔρρίζωται 23.
 ἔρρωγα 22 (1).
 ἔρρων 29 (4), 392.
 ἔρυκανόωσι 60.
 ἐρύκει 29.
 Ἐρύλαος 124 d.
 ἐρυσάρματες 124 c, 125 (5).
 ἐρυσίπολις 124 c.
 ἐρύσσαμεν 39 (2).
 ἐρύσσεσθαι }
 ἐρύσσεται } 63.
 ἔρυτο 11, 12, 18.
 ἐρύω 18, 63, 392.
 ἔρχαται 22 (6), 23, 24, 25.
 ἔρως 107.
 ἔσαν 12.
 ἔσας, ἔσασθαι 39 (1).
 ἔσβη 13, 44.
 ἐσεμάσσω 39 (1).
 ἐσθην 23.
 ἐσθής 390.
 ἐσθίει 51 (1).
 ἐσίδεσκε 396.
 ἔσκε 49.
 ἔσπειρα 39 (3).
 ἔσπερα App. p. 398.
 ἔσπερος 390.
 ἔσπετο 31 (7).
 ἔσπωνται, ἐσποίμην,
 ἐσπόμενος 36 (6).
 ἔσσαι 22 (8).
 ἔσσατο 39 (1).
 ἐσσεΐται 64.
 ἔσσενα 15, 67, 371.
 ἐσσεύοντο 29 (3).
 ἐσσί 5, 12.
 ἔσσο 12.
 ἔσσο 23.
 ἐσσόμενος 244 (1).
 ἔσσο, ἔσσυτο 13, 15.
 ἔσσυται 22 (5), 23.

ἔσσω 64.
 ἐστάθη 43.
 ἐσταότες 26 (1).
 ἔσται 23 (5).
 ἔσταν, ἔστησαν 5, 13.
 ἔστασαν (1 Aor.) 72 (2)
 n. 1.
 ἐστάσι, ἔστασαν 7, 68, 72.
 ἐστέ 12, 87 (1).
 ἔστεφε 29 (6).
 ἔστηκα 22 (9) a, 23.
 ἐστήκασι 7, 24.
 ἐστήκη 80, 283.
 ἔστητε 13 (ἔστητε 25).
 ἔστι 12, 87 (1).
 ἔστιχον 31 (3).
 ἔστο 23.
 ἐστόν 12, 87 (1).
 ἔστρωτο 13, 14.
 ἔστρυγον 31 (4).
 ἔστω, ἔστων 12.
 ἐσχαρόφιν 157.
 ἔσχατος 121.
 ἔσχεθον, ἔσχον 31 (7).
 ἐτάλασσα 39 (2).
 ἔταμον 31 (6).
 ἐτάνυσσα 39 (2).
 ἐτεθήπεα 68.
 ἔτεκον 31 (7).
 ἐτέρωθι 109.
 ἐτέταλτο 22 (6).
 ἔτετμε 36 (6).
 ἐτεύχετον (3 Du.) 5.
 ἔτης 116 (2), 391.
 ἔτι 180.
 ἐτίθει 18.
 ἔτλην, -ημεν 13, 14.
 ἔτορε 31 (5).
 ἔτος 390.
 ἔτραπον 31 (5).
 ἔτραφε 31 (5).
 ἐτράφην App. p. 397.
 ἔτρεμε 29 (5).
 ἐτύχθη 43.
 εὖ 98, 378*.
 εὐαδε 31 (1).

εἰήνωρ 125 (8).
 εὐηφενής 125 (8).
 εὐκλείας, -ῶς 105.
 εὐκτίμενος 125 (6).
 εὐμμελίω 98, 371.
 εὐναιετάων 125 (6).
 εὐνάσω 63.
 εὐνις 116.
 εὐόμενοι 29 (3).
 εὐρε 31 (4).
 εὐρέα 97.
 εὐρίσκω 48.
 εὐρρείος 105.
 Εὐρυμίδης 129.
 εὐρύοπα 96, App. p. 400.
 εὐρυρέων 125 (6).
 Εὐρυτος 129.
 εὖς 94, 384.
 εὔτε (use) 290.
 εὐχετάομαι 60.
 εὐώνυμος 125 (8).
 ἐφάμην 12.
 ἔφαν 5, 12.
 ἐφάνη 42.
 ἔφασκον 49.
 ἐφεΐω 80, App. C.
 ἐφετμή 114.
 ἔφην, -αμεν, &c. 12.
 ἐφῆπται 23.
 ἔφησθα 5, 11.
 ἔφθην 13.
 ἐφθίatio 23.
 ἐφθιε 51 (1).
 ἔφθιθεν 43.
 ἔφθιτο 13.
 ἐφίλατο 39 (3).
 ἐφοπλίσσουσι 63.
 ἐφρασάμην 39 (1).
 ἐφράσθης 44.
 ἔφυν, ἔφυσαν 13.
 ἔφυν 5.
 ἔχαδε 31 (6).
 ἐχάρη 42.
 ἐχάνθανον 47.
 ἐχάρη 42, 44.
 ἐχε-, ἔχεπενυκές 124.

*Εχεται 129.
 ἔχεται, ἐχέατο 15.
 ἔχθεσθαι (ἐχθέσθαι),
 ἐχθόμενος 31 (7).
 ἐχολώθη 44.
 ἔχραε 31 (1), 32.
 ἔχραισμε 31 (3), 32.
 ἔχυτο 15.
 ἔχω 29 (6).
 ἔω 80.
 ἔωθα 23.
 ἐώθειον 67.
 ἐφίκει 67.
 ἐώλπει 67.
 ἔωμεν 80.
 ἐών 29 (6).
 ἐφροχόει 67.
 ἐώργει 67.
 ἔως 265 (2), 273, 288,
 307, App. F (e).

ζαῆν 97.
 Ζάκυνθος 370.
 ζαχρειῶν }
 ζαχρηίς } 105.
 ζεί 29 (6).
 ζειδωρος 124.
 ζευγνύμεν 17, 85 (1).
 ζεύγνουον 18.
 ζεφυρίη 386.
 Ζῆν 97, 106 (2).
 ζήτέω 60.
 ζώννυνται 81.
 ζώννυτο 17.
 ζώος 14.

ἦ, see ἡέ.
 ἦ 338, 339.
 ἦ (ἡμί) 11.
 ἦ 109.
 ἦα 12.
 ἦα 67.
 ἦται, ἦατο 5, 11, App.
 C.
 ἡβώωσα 55 d.
 ἡγάασθε 55 a.

ἡγαγον 36 (1).
 ἡγάσασατο 39 (2).
 ἡγειρα 39 (2).
 ἡγέρονται 125 (8).
 ἡδέε 338.
 ἡδεα, ἡδη 68.
 ἡδησθα 5, 68.
 ἡδύς 114, 116 (4), 391.
 ἡέ, ἦ (ἡε, ἦ) 340, 341.
 ἡείδης, ἡείδει 67, 68.
 ἡεيرة 67.
 ἡεις, ἡει 12, 67.
 ἡεν, ἡην, ἡμεν 12.
 ἡέριος 114* (8).
 ἡθείε 92, 96.
 ἡθελέτην (2 Du.) 5.
 ἡθος 391.
 ἡτία 12, 67.
 ἡῖκτο 23.
 ἡῖον, ἡῖσαν 5, 12, 30.
 ἡῖσκε 67.
 ἡκα 110.
 ἡκαχε 36 (1).
 ἡκω App. p. 397.
 ἡλάσκουσι 48.
 ἡλασσα 39 (2).
 ἡλεύατο 15.
 ἡλήλατο 67, 68.
 ἡλίβατος 124.
 ἥλις 393.
 ἥλιτεν 31 (3).
 ἡλιτόμηνος 125 (8).
 ἥλος 393.
 ἥλυθον 31 (4).
 ἥλφον 31 (1), 32.
 ἥλω 67 *footn.*
 ἡμαρ 107 (2), App. F
 (2).
 ἡμάρτανε 47.
 ἡμβροτε 31 (5), App. F
 (2).
 ἡμέας, ἡμας 100.
 ἡμείων, ἡμέων 101.
 ἡμέν 338.
 ἡμερσε 39 (3).
 ἡμίν, ἡμιν 102.

ἡμός 290, App. F (2).
 ἦν (3 Sing.) 12.
 ἦν (3 Pl.) 5, 12.
 ἦν (use) 292 d, 293, 294,
 362.
 ἦνεια 15, 37.
 ἦνεμόεις 125 (8).
 ἦνιοχῆα 107 (5).
 ἦνίπαπε 36 (7).
 ἦνις 116 (3).
 ἦνιρ 125 (8).
 ἦνον 392.
 ἦντεον 55 (10).
 ἦντεο 31 (1).
 ἦντο 5.
 ἦνυτο 17.
 ἦνώγεα 68.
 ἦνωγον 27.
 ἦξε 390 (p. 363).
 ἦος 273.
 ἦπαρ 107 (2), 114* (8).
 ἦπύτα 96.
 ἦπύω 51 (4).
 ἦρα 392.
 ἥρακλῆος &c. 105 (5).
 ἦραρε 36 (1).
 ἦρασάμην 39 (2).
 ἦρατο 39 (3).
 ἦρήρειστο 23 (3), 25, 28.
 ἦρικε 31 (3).
 ἦρίον 392.
 ἦριπε 31 (3).
 ἦρπαξε, ἦρπασε 39 (1),
 63.
 ἦρυνγε 31 (4).
 ἦρύκακε 36 (7).
 ἦρωος, ἦρω, 384 (1).
 ἦσαν 5, 12.
 ἦσαν 12.
 ἦσθα 5, 12.
 ἦσι 81.
 ἦσαι 11.
 ἦστην 12.
 ἦτε 12.
 ἦτορ 114.
 ἦς 94 (2), 384.

ἡχή 390.
 ἡχθετο 31 (7), 32.
 ἡχι 109.
 ἡώς 114, ἡὼ 368.

θαλαμηπόλος 124 a.
 θάλος 114.
 θάλπω 29 (1).
 θαλπωρή 120.
 θάμα 110.
 θάμβευς 105 (3).
 θαμειαί 111.
 θανέεσθαι 66.
 θάπτε 46.
 θάρσευς 105 (3).
 θάρσος 114.
 θαυμάσσεται 63.
 θεά 95, App. F.
 θέαινα 114.
 θεαῖς 102.
 θέει 29 (3).
 θέειν 29 (3), 51 (3).
 θεΐναι 85.
 θέιω 10, App. C (2).
 θέμεν, θέμεναι 15, 85.
 θέντων 15.
 θέο 5.
 θεόθεν 159.
 Θεοκλύμενος 125 (3).
 θεουδέα }
 θεουδής } 105 (4).
 θεόφιν 155.
 θέρεσθαι 29 (4).
 θέρευς 105 (3).
 θερμετε, θερμετο 32.
 Θερωσίτης 114, 129.
 θερσόμενος 63.
 θές 5, 15.
 Θέτιν 97.
 θέωμεν 80.
 θεώτεραι 122.
 θῆραι 81.
 θήγει 29 (1).
 θήη 80.
 θήκατο 15.
 θήκη 22 (9) *footn.*

θῆλος 114, 115 (4), 116
 (4).
 θηλύτεροι 122.
 θην (use) 352.
 θής 114.
 θῆσθαι 19.
 θλάσσε 39 (1).
 θνήσκον 48.
 θοῦριν 97.
 θοῦρις 116 (3).
 Θόων 129.
 θρασύς 114.
 θρήνυς 114.
 θρώσκουσι 48 (1).
 θνυγάτηρ 111, 115 (6).
 Θυέστα 96, 129.
 θυηλή 120.
 θυμηγερέων 125 (8).
 θύνον 47.
 θύρη, θύραι 171.
 θύρηφιν 157.
 θύω 51 (4).
 θωρήσσεσθον (3 Du.) 5.
 θώων 111.

 ῥα 130 (1).
 ῥά 99*.
 ῥάπτῃ 46.
 ῥασι 5, 11.
 ῥαύω 35.
 ῥαχον 31 (1), 35, 390,
 396.
 ῥάχων 31 (1).
 ῥδεῖν 390.
 ῥδιον 51 (1), 393.
 ῥδμεν (Inf.) 85.
 ῥδρις 114, 116.
 ῥδρώς 107 n.
 ῥδυῖα 26 (3).
 ῥει, ῥεῖς 18.
 ῥεῖη 83.
 ῥεν 5.
 ῥεν 12.
 ῥέναι 85.
 ῥέρευτο 23 (5).
 ῥερός 384.

ῥετο 12.
 ῥάνει 47.
 ῥω 35.
 ῥησθα 5, 80.
 ῥησι 16.
 ῥησι 80, 82.
 ῥθαιγενής 124 f.
 ῥθύς 110, 116 (4).
 ῥθύω 51 (4).
 ῥκάνω 47.
 ῥκέσθαι 31 (3).
 ῥκμενος 40, 86, 243 (1).
 ῥκρόφιν 154.
 ῥκω 39 (2), 393.
 ῥλάονται 51.
 ῥλαος App. F (4).
 ῥλάσκονται 48.
 ῥλάσσονται 39 (2).
 ῥληθι 11, 16.
 ῥλήκησι 22 (9), 80, App.
 p. 397.
 ῥλίοο 98.
 ῥλίοος 392.
 ῥμεν, ῥμεναι 85.
 ῥμερος 114.
 ῥνα (use) 284, 286, 306.
 ῥνεσι 102.
 ῥξον 41.
 ῥοι 30, 83.
 ῥομεν 80, 384.
 ῥον 390.
 ῥπηλάτα 96, 125 (8).
 ῥπημολγός 125 (8).
 ῥπτότα 96, 117.
 ῥριν 97.
 ῥρις, ῥρος 392.
 ῥς 390.
 ῥσαν 5, 7.
 ῥσαισι 7.
 ῥσκω 48.
 ῥσος 390.
 ῥστα 18.
 ῥστη (Imper.) 5, 20.
 ῥστίαια 378.
 ῥστήν 393.
 ῥσχάνει 47.

ἰσχανώσι 60.

ἰσχω 35.

ἰτέη 390.

ἴτην 12.

ἴτυς 390.

ἴφι 110.

ἰφίτιο 98, 129.

ἴχνος 114.

ἰχώρ 107.

ἰω 80.

ἰῶ 130 (1).

ἰῶκα 107 (1).

ἰών 12, 30.

καί (use) 259 (3), 265
(1), 330, 353.

καίνυμαι 17.

καίω 51 (2).

κακκείοντες 59.

καλέουσα 63.

καλέσσαι 39 (2).

καλήμεναι 19.

καλλιγύναικα 124 δ.

Κάλχα 92, App. (p. 321).

καμέτην (2 Du.) 5.

κάμνε 47.

κάρη 107 (5).

καρηκομώντες 125 (6).

κάρκαιρε 61.

κάρτα 110.

κάρτιστος 121.

κάρτος 114.

κασίγνητος 14.

Καστιάνειρα 124 ε.

κάτα 180.

κατάσχεται 397.

κατάκρης 107.

κατακτανέουσι 63.

κατακτάς 13.

καταλέγμενος 40.

καταπτήτην 13.

κατέδραθον 31 (5).

κατέρυσται 396.

κατέκταθεν 43.

κατέπηκτο 40.

κατεσκίαον 55 (10).

κατήκισται 23.

κατηρεφής 125 (8).

κατίσχεαι (Subj.) 82.

κάτω 110.

κανστειρής 111.

καυτός 377.

κέδασθεν 370.

κείαντες App. C (3).

κείθι 109.

κείνος 250.

κεινός 114, 384 (2).

κείομεν App. C (3).

κείται 11, 81.

κείων 51 (3).

κεκαδησόμεθα 65.

κεκαδών 36 (1).

κεκάμω 35, 296.

κεκασμένος 22 (1).

κεκαφήota 22 (9), 28.

κέκευθε 22 (5), 28.

κέκλετο 8, 35.

κεκλήγοντες 27, App. F
(3).

κεκληγυῖα 26 (3).

κεκληγώς 22 (1), 27, 28.

κεκληγώτες 26 (1).

κέκλημαι 22 (9).

κεκλήσῃ 65.

κέκλυθι 22 (5), 28.

κέκμηκας 22 (9), 28.

κεκμηῶτα 26 (1).

κεκόπων 27, App. F (3).

κεκοπώς 22 (8), 26 (5),
28.

κεκορηῶτα 22 (9), 28.

κεκοτηῶτε 22 (9), 28.

κεκράνται 55.

κεκύθωσι 36 (3).

κέλαδος 114.

κέλευθα 99*.

κελευτιύων 60.

κέλης 114.

κέλομαι 29 (4).

κέλσαι 39 (3).

κεν, see ἄν.

κένσαι 39 (3).

κέονται 29 (6).

κέρα 105 (4).

κέρα, κέραι 99.

κέραιε 51 (2).

κεραοξῶος 124 α.

κέρασσε 39 (1).

κέρδιον, κέρδιστος 121.

κέρωνται 87 (3).

κεφαλῆφιν 157.

κεχανδῶς 22 (7), 25 (2).

κεχαρηῶτα 22 (9), 28.

κεχαρησέμεν 65.

κεχάροντο 36 (1).

κεχηνῶτα 22 (1), 28.

κεχολῶσεται 65.

κέχυνται 5.

κέχυται 22 (5).

κῆδει 29 (1).

κηρεσσιφόρητος 124 j.

κίκλησκεν 48.

κίνυντο 17.

κίρνη 17, 29 (4).

κίχάνω 47.

κίχε, κίχεις 18.

κιχείη, κιχήτην 11, 12.

κιχείω, κιχείομεν 80.

κιχήμεναι 12.

κιών 31 (3), 89.

κλάδος 114.

κλαίουσθα 5.

κλαίω 51 (2).

κλέα 105 (4).

κλείω 51 (3).

κλέομαι 29 (3).

κλέπτε 46.

κλητός 14.

κλίνω 54.

κλισίηφι 157.

κλιζώ 53.

κλυθι 13, 32.

Κλυμένη 13, 129.

κνή 19.

κοῖλος 378* g.

κομίδη 114.

κομῶ 63, 64.

κονίοντες 51 (1).

κόπτε 46.
 κορέεις 63.
 κορέσθην 44.
 κόρυν 97.
 κοτέσσαντο 39 (2).
 κοτυληδονόφιν 157.
 κουρρότεροι 122.
 κραδάω 55 (6).
 κραδίη 114.
 κραναήπεδος 124 α.
 κράτεσφι 107 (5).
 κρέα 105 (4).
 κρείων 105 (5).
 κρεμάσαι 39 (2).
 κρεμόω 63.
 κρηῆναι 39 (3), 55.
 κρήθεν 107 (5).
 κριθή 29 (4).
 κρίκε 31 (3).
 κρινθέντες 43.
 κρίνω 29 (4), 54.
 κριός 29 (4).
 κρίπτω 46.
 κτάμενος 13.
 κταέοντα 63, 244.
 κτάσθαι 13.
 κτέαρ 107 (2).
 κτέρα 107 (3).
 κτεριούσι 63, 64.
 κτέωμεν 80.
 κτίμενος 13.
 κυανοχαίτα 96.
 κυδάνει 47.
 κυδιάνειρα 124 δ, 126,
 App. p. 400.
 κυδιών 60.
 κύδιστος 121.
 κύθε 31 (4).
 κυκειῶ 107.
 κύντερος 122.
 κύκλα 99*.
 κυκλόσε 109.
 κυνάμνια 124 ε.
 Κύπριδα, Κύπριν 97.
 κύρσας 39 (3).
 κύων 106 (2).

κῶας 107 (3), 114.
 λᾶας, λᾶαν 107 (5).
 λαβέσθε 87 (4).
 λαβέτην (2 Du.) 5.
 λάε 31 (1), 32.
 λάθε 31 (1).
 λαβικηδής 124 δ, 126.
 λαΐγγες 117.
 λαίος 114.
 λαΐγμα 114.
 λάκε 31 (1).
 λαμπετόωντι 60.
 λανθανόμην 47.
 λαοδάμα 92.
 λαός App. F (4).
 λᾶος &c. 107 (5).
 λαρῶτατος App. p. 399.
 λαφύσσετον (3 Du.) 5.
 λείαινα 114.
 λέβης 114.
 λέγε 29 (6).
 λείβειν 29 (2).
 λείπει 29 (2).
 λειῡστός, ληῡστός 384.
 Λειῡδης App. F (4).
 Λειῡκριτος App. F (4).
 λέκτο 40.
 λελαβέσθαι 36 (1).
 λελακυία 22 (1).
 λέλασται 22 (1).
 λελάχητε 36 (5).
 λέλειπται 25 (2).
 λελείψεται 65.
 λεληκῶς 22 (1), 26 (2),
 28.
 λελημένος 28.
 λελόγγᾱσι 5, 7, 22 (7).
 λελουπα 22 (4), 28.
 λέλυνται 5.
 λελύτο 83 (1).
 λέξεο 41.
 λέξο 40.
 Λεοντεύς 129.
 λεπταλέος 118.
 λεχεποίη 124 δ.

λήγει 29 (1).
 ληθάνει 47.
 λήθομαι 29 (1).
 λήισσομαι 63.
 Λήϊτος 129, App. F (4).
 λίγα 110.
 λίην 136 (2), 384.
 λικριφίς 109.
 λιλαιέαι 51 (2).
 λίπα 110.
 λίσ 371, 372.
 λίσσομαι 53, 371.
 λιτέσθαι 31 (3).
 λοιγός 115 (1).
 λοῡσθαι 11, 29.
 λυσιμελής 124 c.
 λύθη 43, 44.
 λύτο 13.
 λύω 51 (4).
 λῶϊον 121.

μάθον 31 (6).
 μαῖα 92.
 μαίεσθαι 51 (2).
 μαιμάει 55 (6), 61.
 μάκαρ 114.
 μακῶν 31 (1).
 μάλα 110.
 μάν (use) 342, 343.
 μάντις 116 (3).
 μαρμαίροντες 61.
 μάρναο 5, 17.
 μᾶσσεται 63.
 μᾶστιε 51 (1).
 μαχεῖται 63.
 μαχειόμενος 51 (3).
 μαχήσαντο } 63.
 μαχήσσομαι }
 μάψ 110.
 με 97.
 μέγαρον, μέγας 371.
 Μέγην 97.
 μέδοντο 31 (2).
 μεθίεις, μεθιεί 18.
 μεθίησι 81.
 μεθῶμεν 81.

μέλας 114.
 Μελέαργος 124.
 μέλι 107 (2).
 μέλλω (use) 238.
 μέλπεςθαι 29 (4).
 μεμάασι } 7, 68.
 μέμασαν }
 μεμακῦα 22 (1).
 μεμᾶοτε, μεμᾶοτε 26 (1).
 μέματε 22 (7), 28.
 μέμβλεται, μέμβλετο 27.
 μέμβλωκε 22 (9).
 μεμηκῶς 22 (1), 26 (2), 28.
 μέμηλε 22 (2), 28.
 μεμνέφτο 27.
 μεμνήσομαι 64.
 μεμνώμεθα 81.
 μέμονα 22 (7).
 μέμυκε 22 (9), 28.
 μέν (use) 257 (1), 259 (2), 265 (2), 342, 345.
 μενε- 124 *δ*.
 μενοεικής 124.
 μενοινήσι 55.
 μενοινῶ 55 *α*.
 Μέντης, Μέντωρ 129.
 μένω 29 (5).
 μέριμνα 114.
 μέσσητος 121.
 μεσσηγύ(ς) 110.
 μέσφα 109.
 μετά 180.
 μετάβηθι 13.
 μεταπαυόμενοι 193.
 μετείω 80.
 μέχρη(ς) 110.
 μή (use) 278, 281, 303, 316, 328, 358-361.
 μηδέν 356.
 Μηδεσικάστη 124 *φ*.
 μήδεται 29 (1).
 μήν 342, 344.
 μήνις 51 (1).
 μήρα 99*.
 μητέρι, μητέρος 106 (1).

μήτηρ 111, 115 (6).
 μητίετα 96.
 μητρο- 124 *α*.
 μία, μῆς 111.
 μαιφόνος 124 *δ*.
 μιάνην 5, 40.
 μιγάζομαι App. p. 397.
 μιγέωσι 80.
 μιγήσεσθαι 65.
 μίκτο 40.
 μιμνάω App. p. 397.
 μιμνήσκειται 48.
 μίμνω 35.
 μισγάγκεια 124 *δ*.
 μίσγον 48.
 μνάα, μνάασθε 55 *α*.
 μνησθῆναι 44.
 μνησώμεθα 82.
 μνωόμενοι 55 *α*.
 μόγυς 110.
 μοιρηγενής 124 *α*.
 μῶνος 384 (2).
 Μούσα 243 (1).
 μύθαι, μυθείαι 5.
 μῦθος 136 (3).
 μυχοίτατος 121.
 ναιετάω 55 (6), 60.
 ναιετάωσα 55, 60.
 ναίω 51 (2).
 νάσθη 44.
 Ναυσικία 95, 106 (4), 124 *φ*, App. F (3).
 ναυσικλυτός 106 (4), 124 *φ*.
 ναυτίλεται 82.
 ναῦφιν 106 (4), 156.
 νέατος 121.
 νεήλυδες 125.
 νεηίης 116 (2).
 νεήφατος 124 *φ*.
 νεΐαι 5.
 νεικείω 51 (3).
 νέκυσσι 102.
 νέμει 29 (5).
 νέομαι 29 (6).

Νεοπτόλεμος 126.
 νεός, &c., 94 (1), 384(1).
 νεῦον 29 (3).
 νεῦρα App. p. 398.
 νευστάζω App. p. 397.
 νεφέλληγερέτα 96.
 νήϊδα 125 (1).
 νηλέα }
 νηλεῖ } 105 (4).
 νηῦς 94 (1).
 νίζω 46.
 νίπτεσθαι 46.
 νίσσομαι 35.
 νίφω 29 (2).
 νομός 115 (1).
 νόσφι 109.
 νυ, νυν 351.
 νύκτωρ 114*.
 νύμφα 92, App. F (3).
 νῶν 103.
 ξείνος 384 (2).
 ξύμβληντο 5.
 ξύμβληται 88.
 ξυμβλήτην 13, 14.
 ὀγδόατος 121.
 ὀγδοος 130.
 ὀδᾶξ 110.
 ὀ 133, ὀδε 249.
 ὀδοιπόρος 124 *φ*.
 ὀδῶδει 22 (3).
 ὀδῶδῃ 114.
 ὀδῶδυσται 23 (3).
 ὀθομαι 30.
 ὀττηνμι 17, 67, 392.
 οἶδα 22 (4), 23 (5), 390.
 οἰδάνει 47.
 οἶδας 5, 24.
 οἶσσι 102.
 οἰζύνω 51 (4).
 οἴκοι 99.
 οἶκος 390.
 οἶμαι 11.
 Οἰνεύς 129.
 οἰνοβαρεῖων 51 (3).

- οἰνοποτάζων 60.
οἶνος 390.
οἶον (Adv.) 267 (3).
οἶός, οἶων 378* g.
οἰστέμεναι, οἰστέτε 41, 326
(2).
οἶσθα 5.
ὀκκείω 51 (3), 393.
ὀκρυόεις 98.
ὀκτάκνημος 130 (5).
ὀκτώ 130 (4).
ὀλείται 63.
ὀλέκω 45.
ὀλέσθαι 31 (5).
ὀλέσσαι 39 (2).
ὀλέσσει 63.
ὀλιγηπέλων 124 f.
ὀλισθε 31 (3).
ὀλλυμι 17.
ὀλοοίτροχος 124 f.
ὀλωλε 22 (3), 28.
ὀμαρτήτην 19.
ὀμνέτω 18.
ὀμνυμι 17.
ὀμοῖο 98.
ὀμόσαι 39 (2).
ὀμοῦμαι 63, 66.
ὀμφή 393.
ὄναιο 87 (3).
ὄνειαρ 107 (2), 114.
ὀνείρατα 107 (2).
ὀνήμενος 13, 16, 86,
243 (1).
ὄνησο 5, 13.
ὀνίησι 16, 393.
ὄνοιτο 87 (3).
ὀνομάκλυτος 124 e.
ὄνοσαι 5, 11, 39 (2).
ὀνόσεται 63.
ὄο, ὄου 98.
ὀπάσσομεν 63.
ὀπατρας 125 (2).
ὀπιδα, ὀπιν 97.
ὀπίσω 110.
ὀπλεσθαι 32.
ὀπλότεροι 122.
ὀπότε 289, 308.
ὀππ- 108 (2).
ὀπταλέος 118.
ὀπνιε 51 (4), 393.
ὀπωπα 22 (3), 23, 28.
ὀπωπή 114.
ὀπωρινός 117.
ὀπως 285, 306, 326 (3).
ὀργνυα 114.
ὀρεγνύς 17.
ὀρεσίτροφος 124 f.
ὀρέστερος 122.
ὀρέστης 129.
ὀρεσφι 154, 157, 158
(5).
ὀρῆαι } 378* b.
ὀρήτο }
ὀρθαι, ὀρμενος 40.
ὀρνυθι 17.
ὀρνον 18.
ὀρονται 30, 393.
ὀρόω 55 b.
ὀρσεο 41.
ὀρσητε 82.
ὀρσο 40.
ὀρσουσα 63.
ὀρσωμεν 82.
ὀρφανικός 117.
ὀρωρε 22 (3), 28.
ὀρώρει 22 (3).
ὀρώρεται 27.
ὀρώρηται 27.
ὀρωρέχεται 23 (3), 24
(2), 28.
ὀσσα 393.
ὀσσε, ὀσσοισι 107 (1).
ὀσσομαι 53.
ὀστεόφιν 154, 158 (3).
ὀταν (ὄτ' ἂν) 289 (2) a.
ὄτε 289, 308.
ὀτέοισι 108.
ὄτι 133, 269, 270.
ὄτινα 108.
ὄυ 276, 300, 316, 355-
357, 360.
ὄυδ'as 107 (3), 114.
ὄυδ'ει 105 (1).
ὄυδέν 133, 356.
ὄυδενόσωρος 124 f.
ὄυκαλέγων 125 (3).
ὄυθαρ 107 (2).
ὄυκί, see οὐ.
ὄυλόμενος 86, 243 (1).
ὄυλος 114.
ὄυν 349.
ὄυνεκα 268.
ὄυς 107 (2).
ὄυτα 13, 392.
ὄυται 55 (10).
ὄυτάμεναι } 13.
ὄυτάμενος }
ὄυτιδανός 118.
ὄυτος 251.
ὄυτω 110.
ὄφείλω 53.
ὄφέλλει 39 (3).
ὄφρα 273, 287, 307.
ὄχεσφι 154, 158 (5).
ὄχθέω 393.
ὄχλος 393.
ὄχος 114, 393.
ὄψ 393.
ὄψει 5.
ὄψείοντες 59.
παιδοφόνος 124 a.
παιδων 111.
παιφάσσω 61.
πάλαι 99.
παλαίτερος 121.
παλαίφατος 124 f.
παλιμπαλαχθέντας } 125
παλινόρμενος } (6).
πάλιν 110.
παλιώξις 125 (7).
πάλτο 40.
παμφαίνων 61.
πάντη 110, App. p. 398.
πάντοσε 109.
πάππα 92.
παπταίνων 61.
πάρα 180.

παραβλῶπες 128 (3).
 παραπλήγας 128 (3).
 παραφθαίησι 51 (2), 83.
 παρείά App. p. 398.
 παρείθῃ 67.
 παρείπῃ 396 η.
 παρελάσσεις 63.
 παρέξ 227.
 παρέχῃ 384 (1), 397.
 παρθενική 117.
 παροίτεροι 121.
 πάρος 236.
 παρῳήκεν 22 (9).
 πάσαις 102.
 πασάμην 39 (1).
 Πασιθίη 124 f.
 πασιμέλουσα 125 (6).
 πάσων 121.
 πάσχω 48.
 πατέρος, πατρός 106 (1).
 πατρο- 124 α.
 Πατρόκληες }
 Πατροκλῆα } 105 (5).
 Πατροκλῆος }
 Πάτροκλος 129.
 παυσωλή 120.
 παύσωμεν }
 παυσώμεσθα } 82.
 παφλιάζοντα 61.
 πεζός 114.
 πείθω 29 (2).
 πείκετε 29 (2).
 πεινάων 19, 55 (8), App.
 F (4).
 πεινῆμεναι 19.
 πείραρ 107 (2).
 πειρηθῆτον 81.
 Πειρίθοος 124.
 Πεισίστρατος 124 c.
 πείσομαι 63.
 πέλας 110.
 Πελασγικός 117.
 πελάσσετον 41.
 πέλει 29 (4), 33.
 πελέκεσσι 102.
 πέλωρ 114*.

πεμπώβολον 125 (8).
 πέμψωμεν 82.
 πένεσθαι 29 (5).
 πενθείeton 51 (3).
 πενθήμεναι 19.
 πένθος 114.
 πενή 114.
 πεντάετες 130.
 πένταχα 109.
 πεπαθυία 22 (7).
 πεπαρμένος 22 (6).
 πέπασθε 22 (7), 28.
 πεπάσμη 22 (1).
 πέπηγε 22 (1).
 πεπιθήσω 65.
 πεπίθοιμεν 36 (2).
 πέπληγον 27, 68.
 πεπληγυία 26 (3), 28.
 πεπληγώς 22 (1), 27, 28.
 πεπλημένος 22 (9).
 πέπννται 22 (7), 28.
 πέποιθα 22 (4).
 πεποίθασι 7, 24.
 πεποίθεα 68.
 πεποίθης, πεποίθομεν 80.
 πεποιθώς 26 (2).
 πέπονθα 22 (7).
 πέποσθε 22 (5).
 πεποτήγαι 28.
 πεπρωμένος 22 (9).
 πέπτανται 23.
 πεπτηνυία 26 (3).
 πεπτηώς 14, 26 (1), 28.
 πεπύθοιτο 36 (3).
 πέπυσμαι 22 (5).
 περ 353, 365 (1).
 περάαν 63.
 πέραον 55 (10).
 περάσσητε 82.
 πέρθαι 40.
 πέρβετο 29 (4).
 πέρι 180.
 περιδώμεθον 5, 81, 188.
 περιπλομένων 33, 243 (1).
 περνάς 17.
 Περσεύς 129.

Περσεφόνεια 124 d, 129.
 πεσέονται 64, 66.
 πέσσω 46, 53.
 πετεηνός 117.
 πέτεται 29 (6).
 πέτεσθον (3 Du.) 5.
 Πετέω 98.
 πεύθομαι 29 (3), 72 (4).
 πέφαται 22 (7).
 πεφεύγει 27, 68.
 πεφεύγοι 27, 83.
 πεφευγώς 22 (5), 28.
 πεφήσσαι 65.
 πεφήσεται 65.
 πεφιδέσθαι 36 (2).
 πεφιδήσεται 65.
 πέφραδε 36 (4).
 πεφρικυία 22 (6), 26 (3).
 πεφύασι 7, 22 (9) α.
 πεφυγμένος 22 (5), 28.
 πεφυζότες 26 (5).
 πέφυκα 22 (9) α, 28.
 πεφύκᾱσι 5, 7.
 πεφύκη 80, 283.
 πεφυλαγμένος 28.
 πεφυῶτε 26 (1).
 πηγεσίμαλλος 124 c.
 πῑαρ, πῑεира 114.
 πῑήσθα 82.
 πῑθήσθε (πιθήσθε) 87 (4).
 πῑλνται 17.
 πιμπλάνεται 47.
 πιμπλᾶσι 16.
 πῑόμενα 59.
 πῑίπτω 35.
 πῑίσυρες 130 (3), App.
 F (3).
 πῑίτνα 18.
 πῑίτυσσι 102.
 πιφάυσκω 48.
 πῑών 114.
 πλέας, πλέες 121, App.
 F (3).
 πλείων 29 (3), 51 (3).
 πλευρά App. p. 398.
 πλέων 29 (3), 396.

- πληξίππος 124 c.
 πλησίστιος 124 c.
 πλήσσω 53.
 πλήτο 13, 14.
 πνέει, 29 (3).
 πνέει 51 (3).
 ποδάνιπτρον 124 f.
 ποδηγεῖς 125 (8).
 ποδῆνμος 125 (8), 126.
 πόθεσαν 39 (2).
 ποθήμεναι 19.
 πολέας 100.
 πόλεος 94 (2).
 πολέσσι 102.
 πόλητος, &c., 94 (2).
 πόλι 94 (2), 99.
 πόλις } 378.
 πόλιος }
 πόλις 94 (2), 100.
 Πολίτης 129.
 πολλός 107.
 Πόλυβος 129.
 πολυήρατος 125 (8).
 πολυπάμων App. F (3).
 πολὺς 100.
 πόρκης 116 (2).
 πόρφυρε 61.
 πόσε 109.
 πόσει 94 (2).
 πούλῦς 116.
 πρέσβα 110.
 πρήσσω 53.
 πρίατο 13.
 πρίν 236, 297, 310, 354,
 App. p. 401.
 προβέβουλα 22 (3), 25
 (3), 28.
 προβλωσκέμεν 48.
 πρόες 5.
 προίει, προίειν 18.
 πρόμος 121.
 προσαρήρεται 80.
 προσανδήτην 19.
 πρόσσω 110.
 προσώπατα 107 (2).
 προτέρω 110.
 πρότιθεν 5.
 πρόφρασσα 114* (5).
 προφύγοισθα 5.
 Πρωτεσίλαος 124 c.
 Πρωτεύς 129.
 πρώτιστος }
 πρώτος } 121.
 πτήται 81.
 πτολίπορθος 128 (1).
 πτύσσω 53.
 πτωσκάω App. p. 397.
 πτώσσω 53.
 πυθμῖν 114.
 πυθόμην 31 (4).
 πύκα 110.
 πυκιμηδῆς 124 b.
 πύλαι 171.
 Πυλοιογενῆς 124 f.
 πύματος 121.
 πυνθάνομαι 47.
 πύξ 110.
 πυρηφόρος 124 a.
 πυρηκής 124 f.
 πυρίκαυστος 124 e.
 Πυριφλεγέθων 124 e, 125
 (3).
 πῶλαι 378* b.
 πωτάομαι 55 (9).
 ράβδος 114.
 ράπτειν 46.
 ράσσετε 39 (1).
 ρέα, ρεία 110, 395.
 ρέει 29 (3).
 ρέζω 395.
 'Ρελα 95, App. F (4).
 ρέπε 29 (4).
 ρερυνωμένα 23 (2).
 ῥηγμῖν 114.
 ῥηγνῦσι 17, 395.
 ῥηξήνωρ 124 c.
 ῥητός 395.
 ῥιγέω 395.
 ῥίγιον, ῥίγιστα 121.
 ῥίζα 29 (4).
 ῥίμφα 110.
 ῥινός 395.
 ῥιπτάζω App. p. 397.
 ῥίπτω 395.
 ῥύεται, ῥύετο 18.
 ῥύη 44.
 ῥυπώντα 55 c.
 ῥύσθαι 12, 14.
 ῥυσίπολις 124 c.
 ῥυτός 14, 395.
 σαπήη 80.
 σάφα 110.
 σάω 19.
 σβέννυμι 17.
 σβέσσαι 39 (1).
 σέ 97.
 σέθεν 109.
 σείο, σέο, σεῦ 98, 378*.
 σέλᾱ, σέλαι 99.
 σέσηπε 22 (1), 23.
 σήπεται 29 (1).
 Σθένελος 129.
 σίγα 110.
 Σκάμανδρος 370.
 σκέπτεο 46.
 σκίδναται 17.
 σόςος 55.
 σόφς, σόφ 55, 81, 83, 285.
 σπάσατο 39 (1).
 σπείους, σπῆι 105 (5),
 App. C.
 σπένδων 29 (5).
 σπέρχουσι 29 (4).
 σπέσσι, σπήσσι 105 (5).
 σπεύδει 29 (3).
 σταίησαν 83.
 στέαρ 107 (2).
 στείβον 29 (2).
 στείχειν 29 (2).
 στένι 29 (5).
 στεροπηγερέτα 96.
 στεῦται 11.
 στώμεν 80.
 στήη, στήομεν, &c., 80.
 στήθεσφι 154.
 στήτην, &c., 13.

στορέσαι 39 (2).
 στόρνυμι 17.
 στρέφει 29 (4).
 στροφάλιγξ 117.
 στρωφάω 55 (9).
 συλήτην 19.
 συμβλήσεται 326 (1).
 συναντήτην 19.
 σῦνεχές 384 (2), 397.
 συνοχωκότε 22 (2), 28.
 συνώμεθα 81.
 σύριγξ 117.
 σφέ, σφέας, σφᾶς 100.
 σφέων, σφέων, σφῶν,
 101.
 σφέλα 105 (4).
 σφί(ν), σφίσι(ν) 102.
 σφωέ, σφωῖν 103.
 σφῶϊ, σφῶϊν, σφῶ
 103.
 σχεδῆην 110.
 σχετλίη 378.
 σχήσω 14.
 σχίζα 114.
 σῶοντες 55.
 τάθη 43.
 ταλα- 124 *d*.
 ταλαίπωρος 124 *b*.
 τᾶλας 114.
 ταλασίφρων 124 *c*.
 ταλαύρινος 124 *d*.
 ταμεσίχρος 124 *c*.
 ταμῆς, ταμῆς 114, 116
 (2).
 τᾶμνε 47.
 ταυν- 124 *d*.
 ταυνοπίπτερος 124 *c*.
 τάννται 17.
 τανύω 18, 63.
 ταρ 332, App. p. 402.
 τάρπημεν 42.
 ταρπώμεθα 31 (5).
 ταρφεῖαι 111.
 τάρφθη 43.
 τάχα 110.

τε 263, 266, 269, 270,
 272, 331, 332.
 τεθαλυῖα, τεθῆλει 21 (1).
 τεθαροσῆκασι 22 (9), 24.
 τέθηπα 22 (1), 28.
 τεθνᾶσι, τέθνασαν 7, 68.
 τεθνήκᾳσι 22 (9), 24.
 τεθνηῖα 26 (3).
 τεθνηώς 26 (1), App. C.
 τεῖν 99.
 τεῖρεα 107 (3).
 Τειρεσίας 116 (2), 129.
 τειχεσιπλῆτα 124 *f*.
 τέκμωρ 114*.
 τέλειον 51 (3).
 τελέω 63, 378 *c*.
 τέμει 29 (5).
 τέμενος 114.
 τένων 114, 243 (1).
 τέξεσθαι 66.
 τεοῖο 98.
 τέρην 115 (6).
 τέρπειν 29 (4).
 τερπικέραυνος 124, 126.
 τερπωλῆ 120.
 τερσῆμεναι 19, 42.
 τερψίμβροτος 124 *c*.
 τεσσαράβοις 130 (3).
 τεταγών 36 (1).
 τετάρπετο 36 (4).
 τέταται 22 (7).
 τετεύχεται 65.
 τετεύχεται 7, 22 (5).
 τέθηκα 22 (1), 28.
 τετιηότες 22 (9), 28.
 τέτληκα 22 (9), 28.
 τετράρορος App. F (4).
 τέτραπτο 22 (6).
 τέτρατος 130 (3).
 τετράφατο 24 (2), 28.
 τετραχθα 109.
 τετρήχει 22 (1), 28.
 τετρηχυῖα 26 (3).
 τετριγυῖα 22 (6), 26 (3).
 τετριγῶτας 26 (1), 28.
 τέτροφε 22 (6), 28.

τέττα 92.
 τετύκοντο 36 (3).
 τέτυκται 22 (5), 28.
 τετύχηκε 22 (9).
 τετυχηκώς 26 (4).
 τεῦ, τευ 378 *e*.
 τηλεθόωσα 60, 125 (8).
 τηλοῦ 110.
 τί 133.
 τιθεῖ, τίθει 18.
 τιθείσι 5, 87 (2).
 τιθήμεναι }
 τιθήμενος } 16, 20.
 τίθησθα 5, 16.
 τίθησι 16.
 τίκτω 35.
 τίνα, &c., 108 (2).
 τίνυνται 47.
 τίνω 17.
 τίς 108 (2), 248.
 τιτύσκειτο 48.
 τίω 51 (1), 384 (1).
 Τληπόλεμος 126.
 τλήτε, τλήτω 13.
 τό 133, 262.
 τοιγάρ 346.
 τοῖσδεσι 108 (3).
 τράπεζα 130 (3).
 τραπήομεν 42, 80.
 τράφη 42.
 τραφῆναι 43.
 τρεῖ 29 (6).
 τρέπε 29 (4).
 τρέσσαι 39 (1).
 τρέφει 29 (4).
 τριβέμεναι 29 (4).
 τριηκόσιοι 125 (8).
 τριστοιχί 110.
 τρίτατος 121.
 τρίχα, τριχθα 109.
 τρόπεον 55 (10).
 τρόφις 114, 116.
 τρυφάλεια 130.
 τρύχουσι 29.
 τρώγειν 29.
 Τρωϊκός 117.

τρωπάω 55 (9).
 τρώσῃτε 82.
 τρωχάω 55 (9).
 Τρώων 111.
 τύγχανε 47.
 τύπτε 46.
 τυτθά, τυτθόν 134.
 τύχε 31 (4).
 ὑββάλλειν App. F (2).
 ὑγίης 116 (5), App. p. 399.
 ὑδατορεφής 124 a.
 ὕδωρ 107 (2), 114*.
 υἷός 107 (5).
 ὑλάει 55 (6).
 ὕλαον 55 (10).
 ὑμέας 100.
 ὑμείων, ὑμέων 101.
 ὑμῖν, ὕμιν, ὕμμι(ν) 102.
 ὕμμε 97, 100, App. F (2).
 ὑπαί 180.
 ὕπατος 121.
 ὑπείξομαι 396 n.
 ὑπιέρ 180.
 ὑπεμνήμυκε 22 (9).
 ὑπέξ 227.
 ὕπερ 180.
 ὑπέρβασαν 13.
 ὑπερδέα 105 (4).
 ὑπερήφανος 124 a.
 ὑπέρτερος 121.
 ὑπνώοντες 19, 58.
 ὕπο 180.
 ὑπολίζονες 121.
 ὑπώρεια 125 (8).
 ὑπωρόφιος 125 (8).
 ὕσμινι 107 (1), 114.
 ὑψαγόρη 92.
 ὑψηλός 120.
 ὕψι, ὕψου 110.
 φαάνθη 55.
 φάγον 31 (1).
 φάε 31 (1), 32.

φαεσίμβροτος 124 c.
 φαθί, φαμέν, &c., 12, 87 (1).
 φάμεν, φάο, &c., 12.
 φάνεσκε 49.
 φανῇ 81.
 φανήη 80.
 φάνηθι 5.
 φάσκε 48.
 φάτις 114.
 Φεία 95.
 φεῖδεο 29 (2).
 φειδολή 120.
 Φέρεκλος 124, 129.
 φερέμβιος 124 c.
 φέρτε 11.
 φέρτερος 121.
 φεύγω 29 (3).
 φῆ 81.
 φῆη 80.
 φημί 11, 12, 70, 87 (1).
 φῆμς 114.
 φῆς 12, 87 (1).
 φῆσθα, φῆσθα 5.
 φθαίω 51 (2).
 φθάμενος 13.
 φθάν 5.
 φθάνει 47.
 φθέγγεο 29 (5).
 φθέωσι 80.
 φθῆη 80.
 φθῆσι 81.
 φθίεται, φθιόμεσθα 80.
 φθίης 285 (2).
 φθίηφι 157.
 φθίνω 47.
 φθισήνωρ 124 c.
 φθισίμβροτος 124 c.
 φθίτο 83 (1).
 φθίω 51 (1).
 φιλήμεναι 19.
 φιλήρεμος 125 (8).
 φιλοίη 83.
 φιλοπτόλεμος 126.
 φίλτερος 121.
 φοιτήην 19.

φορήμεναι }
 φορῆναι } 19, 85.
 φόρμυγξ 117.
 φοροίη 83.
 φόως 55 (10) *footn.*
 φόρτις 116 (3).
 φραδέος 116 (5).
 φρασί 106 (3).
 φράσσομαι 63.
 φρέιαρ 107 (2).
 φρήτρηφιν 158.
 φρόνις 114.
 φύγον 31 (4).
 φυγοπτόλεμος 126.
 φύζα 114.
 φυλάκους 107.
 φύξηλις 120.
 φύρσω 39 (3).
 φυσίζους 124 c.
 φύω 51 (4).
 χαλέπτει 46.
 χαλίφων 124 b.
 χαμάδις 109.
 χαμαί 99.
 χαμαιεύνης 124 f.
 χάριν 136 (4).
 χάρις 107 (2).
 χάσαστο 39 (1).
 χέει 29 (3).
 χείρεσι 102.
 χειρότερος 121.
 χείσεται 63.
 χείω 51 (3).
 χειρότερος 121.
 χέρηα 121.
 Χερσιδάμας 124 f.
 χήμεις 377.
 χήρατο 39 (3).
 χθίς 110.
 χοροιτυπή 124 f.
 χρίον 29 (4).
 χρόμαδος 114.
 χρώς 107 (2).
 χύτο 13.
 χωρίς 110.

ψευδάγγελος 124 *d*.
 ψευδέεσι 116 (5).
 ψεύδονται 29 (3).

ῶδε 108, 110.
 ὠδύσατο 39 (1).
 ὠθέω 393.
 ὠἶγνυντο 17.
 ὠἶξα 67.
 ὠίσθη 44.
 ὠκα 110.
 ὠκύς 114.

ὠλεσίκαρπος 124 *c*, 125.
 ὠλετο 31 (5).
 ὠμνυε 18.
 ὠνατο 11.
 ὠνος 393.
 ὠνοσάμην 78.
 ὠπα 107 (2).
 ὠρείθυια 125 (8).
 ὠρετο 31 (4).
 ὠριστος 377.
 ὠρμήθη 44.
 ὠρσα 39 (3), 40.

ῶρτο 40.
 ὤς (Demonstr.) 265.
 ὤς 375 (1), 397; (use)
 235, 267, 285, 306.
 ὤς εἰ 295, 312.
 ὤσασκε 49.
 ὤσι 81.
 ὤσί 107 (2).
 ὤς τε 235, 285 (3) *a*.
 ὠντός 377.
 ὠφελον } 33.
 ὠφελλον }

POST-HOMERIC FORMS

(including Hesiodic, Ionic and Attic forms quoted.)

αἶνῃμι 12.
 αἰσθέσθαι 32 (2), 34.
 αἰῶ (Acc.) 107.
 ἀμαρτίνοος 126.
 ἀνδράποδον 107 (1).
 ἀνωγμεν 25 (1).
 ἀπέφατο 13.
 ἀρα 347.
 ἀρήρεται (Subj.) 80.
 ἀρηρνύα 26 (3).
 βάθος 114.
 βεβρωῶτες 26 (4).
 βλαστέιν 34.
 γεγονώς 26 (4).
 γοῦν 349.
 δέδοιγμεν 25 (1).
 δῆθεν, δῆτα 350.
 διδόασι 7.
 δικεῖν 34.
 εἰαντῇ 108.
 ἔδον (2 Aor.) 7, 15.
 ἔθεν (2 Aor.) 7, 15.
 εἰ (2 Sing.) 5.
 εἴληφα 23 (2).
 εἴξασι 7 (3).
 εἶτα 318.

ἐκεῖ 109.
 εἴοιγμεν 25 (1).
 ἐπέφυκον 68 (1).
 ἐπίσχε 88.
 ἐρήρισται 23 (3).
 ἐρρωγα 22 (1).
 ἔρσην App. F (*f*).
 ἔρωτα (Acc.) 107.
 ἐτεύχθη 43.
 ἔχθομαι 31 (7).
 ἦν (1 Sing.) 12.
 ἦς, ἦστε 12.
 θιγεῖν 34.
 ἱκτο 40.
 ἱλαμαι 16.
 καίτοι 346.
 κανεῖν 34.
 κᾶλός App. F (*h*).
 κέκοφα 24 (2).
 κέκραγα 28, 31 (1).
 κεκρύφαται 24 (2).
 κέκτημαι 23 (2).
 κλύω 31 (4).
 κρύφα 110.
 κτίννυμι 17.

μέντοι 346.
 μηδεῖς 356.
 οἶδαμεν, οἶδασι 24 (1).
 ὅμως 337.
 ὅσσοισι 107 (1).
 πάθος 114.
 πῖθι 32 (1).
 πίνω 17.
 πλέως 384.
 πόλεως 94 (2).
 σχές 5.
 τανύπτερος 126.
 τεθηλυία 26 (3).
 τεθηγκώς 26 (4).
 Τερψιχόρη 124 *c*.
 τέτοκα 22 (8).
 τιθέασι 7.
 τοῖνυν 346.
 ὑμνεῖω 51 (3).
 φερέοικος 124 *d*.
 φερεσσακῆς 124 *f*.
 φρασί 106 (3).
 χρέα 105 (4).
 ὦν (οὖν) App. F (*f*).
 ὤς (Prep.) 228.

INDEX II.

OF SUBJECTS.

N.B.—The figures refer to the sections.

- Ablative:** the Ending -ως 110, 160 :
 Ablative Genitive 146, 152, 153 :
 with Prepositions 178, cp. περί 188
 (1), παρά 192, ὑπό 204 (1), (3), ἀνά
 209, κατά 213 (1), ὑπέρ 219, ἐξ 223,
 ἀπό 224, πρό 225 : -φι(v) 156 : -θεν
 159.
- Accentuation:** the Verb 87 : Com-
 pound Verbs 88 : Inf. and Part. 89 :
 Nom. Sing. in -ᾱ 96 : Acc. in -v 97 :
 Case-forms 111 : the Vocative 112 :
 Primary Nouns 115 : Compounds
 128 : Prepositions 180 : the Re-
 flexive Pronoun 253 (2) : ἀνυῶ, ἐρυνῶ
 (Fut.) 64 : -δε 335 : ἐπειή, τῆ or τήη
 339 : ἡέ—ῆε 340.
- Accusative:** Singular 97 : Plural
 100 : Adverbial 110, 133-6 : in
 Compounds 124 f. : Internal Object
 132 ff. : 'part affected' 137, 139
 (3) : Time and Space 138 : with
 Adjectives 139 : External Object
 140 : Acc. *de quo* 140 (3), 237 (2),
 245 (2) : of the *terminus ad quem* 140
 (4) : Double Acc. 141 : Whole and
 Part 141 : with Prepositions 178 :
 with παρέξ 227 : with the Infinitive
 237, cp. 240 : with a Participle
 245 : δ, δτι, δ τε 269, 270 : with -δε
 335.
- Adjective** 165 : Adverbial uses 134 :
 predicative 162 : Gender 166 :
 Participle 243 : the Article with
 Adjectives 260 : in -ύς 116 (4) : in
 -ης 116 (5) : in -ειος, -πος, -μος,
 -ινος, -εις, -ικός 117 : -αλέος, -άλμος,
 -ενός (-ενός), -διος, -δανος 118 :
 Comparison of Adjectives 121, 122.
- Adverbs** 90 : Adverbial Suffixes 109,
 110, 160 : use of Neuter Pronouns
 133 : Neuter Adjectives 134, 139
 (1) : other Accusatives 135-139 :
 -θεν 159 : -ως 160 : -ως in the Pre-
 dicate 162 (5) a : adverbial use of
 Prepositions 175, 176 : see esp.
 ἀμφί, περί, πάρα, μέτα, ἐπι, ὑπο, προτί,
 ἀνά, ἐνι, πρό, and cp. 227 : Relative
 Adverbs 267 : δ, δτι, δ τε 269, 270.
- Æolic:** Verbs in -μι 12, 19 : Opt. in
 -σεια 83 (3) : Opt. in -φην, -οιην 19,
 83 : Nom. Sing. Masc. in -ᾱ 96 : ἀορ,
 ῆτορ 114 : κεν 364 : υ for φ 404 :
 Fick's Theory, App. p. 486 ff. πίσυρες
 130 (3) : ἀβροτάξομεν App. p. 402.
- Anacoluthon** 163, 243 (3) d, 353.
- Anaphoric Pronouns** 247 : ὅδε 249 :
 κείνος 250 : οὗτος 251 : αὐτός 252 :
 ἔο, &c. 253 : δ ἡ τό 256.
- Antecedent to Relative:** definite 262 :
 omitted 267 (2), (3) : attracted by
 the Rel. 267 (4) : attracting the
 Rel. 267 (5) : τό 269.
- Aorist** 13-15 : Thematic 31-34 : Re-
 duplicated 36 : in -ᾱ 37 : Sigmatic
 or Weak 39, 40 : in -σε (ο) 41 : in
 -ην 42 : in -θην 43 : meaning 21,
 44, 75-8, cp. 298 : Aor. Inf. after
 πρίν and πάρος 236.
- Apocope of Prepositions** 180*.
- Apodosis:** Ellipse of 324*, δέ in
 apodosis 334.
- Archaic forms:** in Composition 124 b :
 Gen. in -οιο 149 : in -οο 98, 368 :
 forms in -φι(v) 154 : ἀνέρυσαν 337 :
 false archaism 82, 83, 158 *fin.*,
 216.

- Aristarchus** : 2 Dual in -την 5 : Voc. of Κάλχας, &c. 92 : Dual 173 : Accent of Prepositions 180 : Aor. and Fut. Inf. 238 : Reflexive Pronoun 255 : Subj. after a past tense 298 : readings due to loss of *f* 389 : *πρότιθεν* 5 : *ἦσθα(ς)*, *οἶσθα(ς)* 5 : *ἐβήσετο*, *ἐδύσετο* 41 : *γε μάσσεται* (*γαμέσσεται*) 63 : *ἔδεια* 67, 394 : *Βεβλήκοι* 83 : *Ῥεία* 95, App. F (4) : *φυλακούς* 107 (1) : *Βιάνωρ* App. F (4) : *παρεῖά* App. p. 398.
- Aristophanes** (Gramm.) 298, 389.
- Article**, ὁ ἡ τό, 256-264 : Articular Infinitive 242 *fin*.
- Attraction** 239 : in Infinitival Clauses 240 : of the Relative 267 (4), (5), 271 (1).
- Augment** 9, 67 (cp. 371), 68, 69, App. p. 402.
- Cases** 90-112 : in Compounds 124 *f*.
- Causative** or Transitive meaning : the Non-Thematic Present 21 : Reduplicated Aorist 36 : Verbs in -ew and -ow 58 : Future Active 66.
- Cause** or **Reason** : Dat. of 144 : *ἐπὶ* c. Gen. 204 (3) : *διὰ* c. Acc. 215 : *ὥς*=*ὅτι* οὕτως, &c. 267 (3) *a* : Causal Conjunctions 268, 270 : Clauses 270*, 273 (1) : Particles, *ἔρα* 347, *γάρ* 348.
- Comitative** sense of the Dative 144 : of forms in -φι(v) 155 : see **Instrumental**.
- Comparison** of Adjectives 121, 122, App. p. 399 : Gen. with Comparatives 152.
- Concession** : Opt. of 299 *d*, 300 *d*.
- Condition** 273 (3) : Conditional Purpose 275 : Expectation 300 : Protasis, with the Relative 283, 305 : with *ὥς*, *ὅπως* 285 (3), 306 (1) : *ὅφρα* 287 (2) : *ὅτε* 289 (2), 308 (1) : *ἐπεὶ* 296, 309 : *πρίν* 297, 310 : *εἰ* 292, 311, 313, 317, 318, 326 (4) : with a Past Indic. 324 : with the Future 326 (1) : with *γε* 354 : *οὐ* and *μή* 316, 359.
- Conditional** Particles, *κε(v)* and *ἄν* : in—
- Principal Clauses, with the Subj. 275, 276 *b*, the Opt. 300, Secondary Tenses 324, the Fut. Ind. 326 (1).
- Final Clauses, with *ὅς* and the Subj. 282, *ὅς* and the Opt. 304 (1) *b*, *ὅς* and the Fut. Ind. 326 (3) : *ὥς*, *ὅπως* and the Subj. 285 (2), *ὥς*, *ὅπως* and the Opt. 306 (1) : *ἵνα* and the Subj. 286 : *ὅφρα* and the Subj. 287 (1), *ὅφρα* and the Opt. 307 : *ἕως*, *εἰς* *ὅ* and the Subj. 288, *ἕως*, *εἰς* *ὅ* and the Opt. 307 : *ὅτε*, *ὅποτε* and the Subj. 289 (1) *b* : *εἰ* and the Subj. 293.
- Object Clauses, with *ὥς*, *ὅπως* and the Subj. 285 (2) : *εἰ* and the Subj. 294, *εἰ* and the Opt. 314.
- Conditional and Temporal Clauses : with *ὅς* and the Subj. 283 *b*, *ὅς* and the Opt. 305 : *ὥς*, *ὅπως* and the Subj. 285 (3) *b*, *ὥς* and the Opt. 306 (1) *fin* : *ὅφρα* and the Subj. 287 (2) : *ἕως*, *εἰς* *ὅ* and the Subj. 288 : *ὅτε*, *ὅποτε* and the Subj. 289 (2), *ὅτε* and the Opt. 308 (1) *fin*, *εἵτε* and the Subj. 290 : *ἐπεὶ* and the Subj. 296, *ἐπεὶ* and the Opt. 309 : *πρίν* and the Subj. 297 : *εἰ* and the Subj. 292 *b*, *εἰ* and the Opt. 313, *εἰ* and the Fut. Ind. 326 (5).
- Infinitival Clauses 238.
- Conjunctive**, see **Subjunctive**.
- Contraction** 378* : in Non-Thematic Verbs 19 : Verbs in -aw, -ew 56 : Future 64 : Subjunctive 81 : Infinitive 85 : Nouns 105 : Comparatives 107 (4), 378* *f* : words with original *f* 378* *g*, 396.
- Correlation** 262, 267.
- Crisis** 377, App. p. 399.
- Dative** : Singular 99 : quantity of -ι 373 : Plural 102 : Dual 103 : accent 111 : in Compounds 124 *f* : uses 142-5 : forms in -φι(v) 158 : with Prepositions 178, 229 (3) : with *ἄμα*, *μίγδα*, *ὁμῶς* 228 : with the Infinitive 239 : Attraction 240 : see also **Infinitive**.

Deictic Pronouns 247: *ὅδε* 249: *κεῖνος* 250: *οὗτος* 251: *ὁ ἡ τό* 261 (2).

Deliberation: Subj. of 277, 280: Opt. (past) 302.

Demonstrative Roots 90: Pronouns 247: *ὅς*, &c. 265: Correlatives 267.

Denominative Nouns 113: Suffixes 117: Verbs 120.

Desiderative Verbs 59.

Diaeresis 367, 382.

Digamma 388-405: 23, 67, 372, 378* *g*.

Diminutives not Homeric, 117.

Dual 173: Endings 5.

Elision 376: ep. 398 (*f*).

Ellipse (real or supposed): after Prepositions 177: of the antecedent to a Relative 267 (2), (3): of the Verb to be after a Relative 271: of a Verb of fearing 278 *b*: of a Conditional Apodosis 318-321, 324*.

Enclitic Verbs (*εἰμί*, *φημί*) 87 (1), 88: Pronouns 98, 100, 103: Particles, viz. *τε* 331, 332, *-δε* 335, *τοι* 346, *ῥα* 347, *νυ* 351, *θην* 352, *περ* 353, *γε* 354, *κεν* 363 *fin.*: order 365.

End: Inf. 231, 242: Final Clauses 273 (4): Subj. of purpose 275: *μή* 278, 281 (1), 303 (1): Relative Clauses 282, 304, 322: *ὥς*, *ὅπως*, *ἵνα* 285, 286, 306 (1): *ὥσπερ*, *ὥς* 287, 288, 307: *εἰ* 293, 314, 319: Past Tenses 325: Fut. Indic. 326 (3).

Final, see *End*.

Frequentative Verbs 60.

Future in *-σω* 63: in *-σεω* 64: from Perfect and Aorist Stems 65: Middle 66: with *κεν* 326 (1): for the Imperative 326 (2): in Final Clauses 326 (3): in Object Clauses 326 (4): with *εἰ* 326 (5).

Gender: of Primary Nouns 116: Denominative Nouns 119: Adjectives 166: Pronouns 167.

Genitive: Singular 98: Gen. in *-οο* 98: Plural 101: Dual 103: accent 111: in Compounds 124 *f*: uses 146-153; forms in *-φι(ν)* 158: with

Prepositions 178, 179: Double Prepositions 227: Improper Prepositions 228: Gen. Absolute 246: see *Ablative*.

Herodian: *ἐπίσχοις* 83: *φίς* 87 (1): *ιστάσι*, &c. 87 (2): *δίνωμαι* 87 (3): *διάθωμαι* 88: *ἐνίσπες*, &c. 88: *ἀνάχρησθαι*, &c. 89: *-as*, Dat. *-α*, 99: *ἐπακούσαι* (after a past tense) 298: *ταρ* 332 (1).

Hiatus 379-382: proof of loss of *f* 390-393, 401-403: of *σ* 397.

Homeric and later Greek:

A. *Differences of form*:—*ἑσσι*, *εἰ* 5: 2 Sing. *-σθα* 5: 3 Plur. *-εισι*, *-ουσι*, *-υσι* 5: 3 Plur. Pf. *-ἄσι* 5: 3 Plur. *-ν*, *-σαν* 5: 3 Plur. Mid. *-ἄται*, *-ἄτο*, 5: 3 Du. Impf. *-τον* 5: Aorists in *-κα* 15: Present with *-νη*, *-νυ* 17: Non-Thematic Contracted Pres. 19: Variation in Perfect Stem 22: Pf. of Verbs in *-αω*, *-εω*, *-οω*, *-υω* 22 (9): aspiration in the Pf. 24 (2): Pf. Part. 26: Thematic Aorists 34: Reduplicated Aorists 36: Aorists in *-σσα* 39: Aorists in *-σ-* 40: Aorists in *-σε* (*-σο*) 41: Aorists in *-θην* 43: Iterative forms 49: Verbs in *-ω*, *-αιω*, *-εω*, *-υω* 51: Assimilation 55: Contraction 56, 105, 378*: Synizesis 57, 105 (3), 378: Frequentatives 60: Intensives 61: Future in *-σσω* 63: Future Passive 65: Pluperfect 68: Loss of Augment 69: Subj. of Non-Thematic Tenses 80, 81: *-ωμι*, *-ησι* in the Subj. 82: Inf. in *-μεναι*, *-μεν* 85: Masc. Nouns in *-τᾶ* 96: Acc. in *-τι*, *-τιν* 97: Gen. in *-οο*, *-οιο* 98: Dat. Sing. in *-τι* 99, 373: Acc. Plur. in *-τις*, *-τις* 100: Dat. Plur. in *-εσσι* 102: Instrum. in *-φι(ν)* 104: Hyphaeresis 105 (4): variation of the Stem 106: Heteroclitite Nouns 107: *-δε* 109: Adverbs in *-ᾶ* 110: Nouns in *-τυς* 114: Fem. *θήλυς*, *ἡδύς*, *πουλύς* 116 (4): Adjectives in *-ης* (*-εσ*) 116 (5), App. p. 399: in *-ικός* 117: Diminutives 117: *-αλῆος*, *-άλμιος*, *-ενός* 118: Verbs in *-ιαω* 60:

Abstract Nouns in -ωρη, -ωλη 120 : Stems in -ι, -σϛ, -ε, -σε 124 : Verbals in -τεος 246* : ἔστε, ἀχρη, μέχρη with Opt. 307 : ἡέ 340 : ἄρα 347 : νύ 351 : οὐκ 355 : μηδείς 356 : Rules of 'Position' 370 : lengthening before λ, μ, ν, σ, δ 371 : short syllables lengthened in *arsis* 375 : Elision 377 : Synizesis 378 : Contraction 378* : shortening of long vowels and diphthongs before Hiatus 380, 381 : 'doubtful' syllables 383-6 : Digamma 388-403.

B. *Differences of usage (Syntax)* :—

Middle Voice 8 : Perfects expressing attitude, &c. 28 : intransitive Perfects 28 : ἄγω 72 (2), 2, App. p. 398 : historical Present 74 : Aorist of the immediate past 76 : gnomic Aorist 78 (2) : Adverbs in -ως 110, 160 : Acc. Neut. as an Adverb 134 : Dat. of the reason 144 : comitative Dat. 144 : locative Dat. 145 : objective Gen. 147 (1) : Gen. of Place 149 : ablative Gen. 152 n. : uses of -φι(ν) 154-158 : uses of -θεν 159 : interjectional Nom. 163 : Plural of single objects 171 : Neut. Plur. with Singular Verb 172 : Prepositions 175, 176, 178, 229 : Anastrophe 180 : ἀμφί c. Dat. 182 : πέρι *beyond* 185 : περί c. Dat. 186 : c. Gen. 188 (1) : παρά c. Dat. 190 : c. Gen. 192 : μετά c. Dat. 194 : c. Gen. 196 : ὑπό c. Gen. 204 (3) : πρὸς c. Acc. 207 : ἀνά c. Dat. 209 : διά c. Acc. of *space* 215 : σύν c. Dat. 221 : πρό of *time* 225 : ἀντί 226 : Double Prepositions 227 : Infinitive 231 : Inf. as Subject 234 : after ὅς, ὅσος 235 : as an Imperative 241 : as an indeclinable Noun 242 : Future Participle 244 : οὗτος 251 : εἰ, οἱ, ἐ, ἐός (ῥε) as a 'general' Reflexive 255 : the Article 257-264, esp. 257 (1), 259, 260 b, e, f, g, 261 (2), (3) : ὅς, ὥς, &c. Demonstrative 265 : ὃ τε, ὅς τε, 266, 272 : οὐνεκα 268 : ὃ 269 (1), 270 : ὃ τε 269 (3), 270 : the Subj.

with *κεν* or *ἄν* in Principal Clauses 275 a, b, 276, 279 : μή οὐ 278 : ὅς with Subj. of *purpose* 282 : pure Subj. with ὅς 283 a : with ὅτε, ὁπότε 289 (1) a, (2) a : with εὐτε and ἦμος 290 : with εἰ 292 a : with ὥς εἰ 295 : with ἐπεὶ 296 : πρὶν *ἄν* 297, App. p. 400 : the Subj. after a Past Tense 298 : the Opt. of *supposition* used without *κεν* or *ἄν* 299f : with *κεν* or *ἄν* of an event which has not occurred 300 c : Opt. and *κεν* or *ἄν* with ὥς 306 (1) : with ἕως and ὅρα 307 : with ὅτε 308 (1) : with εἰ 313 : εἰ οὐ 316 *fin.*, 359 : εἰ δ' ἄγε 320 : Moods 322 : Indicative 323 : Past Tense with *κεν* or *ἄν* in the *iterative* use 324 : Impf. with *κεν* or *ἄν* referring to the present 324 : Fut. Ind. with *κεν* or *ἄν* 326 (1), (2) : τε as a Particle of transition 331 n. : τε in *general* statements 332 : τ' ἄρα, ἡ τε 332 : enclitic δέ 335 : αὐτάρ, ἀτάρ 336 : αὐ, αὐτε 337 : ὁμῶς, ἑμῆς 337 : μάν, μέν (= μήν) 345 : τοιγάρ, τοίνυν 346 : ῥα, ἄρα 347 : γάρ 348 (3) : οὖν, γ' οὖν 349 : δὴ beginning the Clause 350 : δῆτα, δῆθεν, δῆπου, καὶ δὴ 350 : νυ 351 : θην 352 : περ, καὶ—περ 353 : οὐδέν 356 : μή 358 a, b, 359, 361 : *κεν*, *ἄν* 362, 363 : Order of Particles 365.


Hyphaeresis 5 (2 Sing. of Verbs in -εω), 105 (4), 378* b.

Iliad and *Odyssey*, differences: ἔθεν 109 : ἀμφί c. Gen. with Verbs of *saying*, &c. 182 : περί 188 (3) : μετά c. gen. 196 : ἐπὶ c. Acc. of *persons* 199 (2) : of *extent* 199 (4) : with forms in -φι(ν) 157 : πρὸς c. Dat. in *addition* to 206 : ἀνά c. Gen. 209 : ἀνά with Collectives 210 : κατὰ with Collectives 212 (1) : κατὰ *πρῆξιν*, &c. 212 (3) : διὰ *νύκτα* 215 : ἐν of *persons* 220 : ἐξ in *consequence* of 223 : Inf. after a Rel. (ὥς, &c.) 235 : Acc. c. Inf. 237 (3) : Gen. Absolute 246 : τίς 248 : Reflexive use of εἰ 253 : Art. with δέ, αὐτάρ, &c. 259 a : with μέν 259 (2) :

- Defining Art.** 261 (1, 3): *τό* wherefore 262 (3): *ὅς* as a Demonstr. 265: *οὕνεκα* that 268: *ὅτι* that 269 (2): Indirect Discourse 270*: Attraction of Rel. 271 (1): Final Rel. Clauses 282 *fin.*: *κε(v)* in general sentences 283 *b*: Opt. with *κεν* of unfulfilled condition 300 *c*: of concession 300 *d* (α): *εἰ* and Opt. after a Present 311: *εἰ γάρ*, *εἴθε* 312: Object-Clauses with *εἰ* and Opt. 314: *τὴν* 339: *μάν*, *μήν*, *μέν* 342: *μὲν οὖν* 349: *ἥ μή* 358 *c*: neglect of Position 370 *fin.*: Hiatus 382: *f* of *ἄρνα*, *ἔρδω* 390.
- Iliad**, characteristics of particular books (esp. ix. x. xxiii. xxiv):—Pf. in -*κα* 22 (8): *χωρ-ός* 107 (2): *ἐπὶ* *c.* Acc. of extent 199 (4): *διὰ νύκτα* 215: *ἐν* with persons 220 (1): with abstract words 220 (2): *ἐκ γενεῆς*, *ἐκ θυμοῦ* 223: Attributive Art. 260 *f, g*: defining Art. 261 (3): Art. in book x 264 *n.*: Opt. with *κεν* or *ἄν* in First Person 300 *n.* (α): Opt. in iterative sense 312: *δέ* of the Apodosis 334 *fin.*: *νῦν* 351: *οὐδέν* 356: Inf. with *ἄν* 362 (8): neglect of Position 370 *n.*: Hiatus 382.
- Imperative** 327, 328: Imperative use of the Inf. 241: Subj. 274, 275, 278: Opt. 299 *b*, 300 *n.* (β).
- Imperfect** 9, 71, 73, 74, see **Present**.
- Impersonal Verbs** 161, 162 (5): with an Inf. 233, 234 (2).
- Indicative** 323-6.
- Indirect Discourse**, introduced by *ὅ*, *ὅτε*, *ὅτι*, *ὥς*, *οὕνεκα* 270*: Impf. in 71 (2): Indirect or Dependent Question 248, 267 (2) *c*: Subj. in 280: Opt. in, with *ἥ—ἥ* 302: Opt. with *ὥς* 306 (2).
- Infinitive** 84: form 85: accent 89: uses 231-241: origin and history 242: with the Article 259 *fin.*: *οὐ* 360: *μή* 361: with *ἄν* 238.
- Instrumental in -φι(v)** 104: uses of -φι(v) 154-8: Instrumental Dat. 144.
- Intensive Verbs** 61.
- Interrogative Pronouns** 108 (2), 248.
- Interrogative Clauses** 273: Subj. 277, 280: Opt. 302: Particles (ἥ) 338: Disjunctive question (ἥέ, ἥ) 340: Dependent question 341: expecting a negative answer 358 *c*.
- Intransitive uses of the Middle Voice** 8 (3): Non-Thematic Tenses 21: the Perfect Active 28: Aorists in -*ην* and -*θην* 44: Verbs in -*ω* 58.
- Iterative Verbs** 48: Tenses 49: Opt. with *ὅπως* 306 (2): with *ὅτε* 308 (1) *d*: with *εἰ* 311.
- Locative: Dative** 145: -*θι* 109: -*φι(v)* 157: in Compounds 124 *e*: with *πρό* 225.
- Manner, Adverbs of** 109, 110: Dat. of 144: -*ως* 160: Adj. in the Predicate 162 (2).
- Metathesis** 14: of Quantity 55 (1), 98.
- Metre** 366-405: affecting forms, Dual in -*την* 5, *σχεθέειν* 31 (7), *στροφάει*, *κρεμάσαι* 39 (2): affecting syntax, Gender 119, forms in -*φι(v)* 154, *μετά* 195, *ἐπὶ* 199 (1), *ὑπό* 202, *διὰ* 216.
- Negative Clauses** 273: Subj. 276: Opt. 299 *e*, 300 *n.* (β): *οὐ*, *μή* 355-361: *ἄν* 363 (2) *a*.
- Neuter: Pronouns** 133, 161: Adjectives 134, 162 (5) *a*, 166 (3): Neut. Plur. 99*: of things 166 (2): with a Singular Verb 172: Article 257 (4), (5) *b*, 260 *b*: Relative 269, 270: quantity of -*a* 374.
- Nominative: Sing.** 96: use in the Predicate 162, 245: interjectional Nom. 163.
- Number** 169-173.
- Object: Acc. of (External and Internal)** 132-140: Gen. of 147 (1): 'Objective' Compounds 126: Object Clauses 273 (2): with *οὕνεκα* 268: *ὅ*, *ὅτι*, *ὅτε* 269, 270, 270*: *μή* 281 (2), 303 (2): Relative 282, 304 (2): *ὥς*, *ὅπως*, *ἵνα* (Subj.) 285 (2), 286, (Opt.) 306 (2): *ὅποτε* 308 (2): *εἰ* 294, 314.

- Obligation**, expressed by the Inf. 231,
241 : by an abstract Noun 162.
- Odyssey*, see *Iliad*.
- Optative** : form 83 : uses 299-314,
362 : history 315-322.
- Oratio Obliqua*, see *Indirect Discourse*.
- Order** : in Compounds 126, 127 : Art.
261 (1) : Clauses 311, 359 c : Parti-
cles 365, cp. 330 : τε 331, 332 : δε
333.
- Parataxis** 267 (3) n., 318-321 : cp.
277, 278 b, 281 (2), 297.
- Participle** 84, 86, 230 : accent 89 :
uses 77, 86, 243-6.
- Particles** 329-365.
- Passive use of the Middle Voice** 8 :
Aorists 42-4.
- Perfect form** 22-26 : meaning 28.
- Person-Endings** 2-5 : -ω, -α 4 (*footn.*) :
-μ, -σ (Subj.) 82 : -οι (Opt.) 83.
- Personal** (opp. to *Impersonal*) 234 : see
Pronouns.
- Persons** (opp. to *Things*) : Acc. 140 (2), (3)
a, 141 : 'true' Dat. 143 : locative
Dat. 145 (7) : Gen. with Verbs of
hearing, &c. 151 d : Gen. of *material*
151 e : Gen. with Verbs of *ruling*
151 f : Gender κατά σύνεσιν 166,
167 : (Number) 172 : παρά c. Dat.
190, c. Gen. 192 : μετά c. Dat. 194 :
ἐνί c. Acc. 199 (2) : πρὸς c. Gen.
208 : ἐνί 220.
- Place** : Adverbs of 109, 110 : Accusa-
tive 138 : Dative 145 : Genitive 149,
152 (Abl.) : Prepositions 229 (5).
- Pluperfect** 9, 68 : cp. 73, 76, 283 a.
- Plural** : form 100-102 : Dat. Plur.
145 (7) : Collective Nouns 169 : of
Things 171 : Neuter 166 (2) : Neuter,
with a Singular Verb 172 : after ἐνί
220 : ἐ, ἐς, &c. 255.
- Position** 370, cp. 397.
- Predicate** 1, 2 : Gen. in the 148 :
Nom. in the 162 : Secondary 162
(3) : Tertiary (implied Predication)
168, 245 : Preposition as the 177 :
Acc. as Predicate with an Infinitive
240 : Participle in the 243 (2), (3),
245.
- Predicative** (opp. to *Demonstrative*)
Stems and Roots 90.
- Prepositions** 174-229 : accent of
Verbs in Composition 88 : in Com-
position with Nouns 125 (4), 127 :
governing the Acc. 140 (4) : the
Dat. 144 (Instr.), 145 (Loc.), 229
(3) : the Gen. (Abl.) 152, 229 (4) :
forms in -φ(υ) 155-7, 158 (5) : forms
in -θεν 159 : with ἐο, οἱ, ἔ 253 : with
the Art. 257 (5) a.
- Present** 9, 10 : Simple Non-Thematic
11 : Reduplicated Non-Thematic
16 : in -vη (-vā) and -vu 17 : The-
matic forms 18 : Non-Thematic
contracted forms 19 : Simple The-
matic 29 : *id.* with weak Stem 30 :
Reduplicated Thematic 35 : with
Suffix 45-57 : collateral forms 62 :
meaning 70-74 : meaning of the
I-Class 58-61.
- Price** : Gen. of 153 : Dat. (Instr.)
144.
- Prohibition** 273, 355 : μή with the
Subj. 278, 281 : *denial* under the
form of prohibition 299 e, 358 b.
- Pronouns** 90 : Declension 93, 97-
103 : uses 247-272 : Heteroclite
108 : forms in -θεν 109, 159 : in
-ρεος 122 : Neuter used adverbially
133 : Subject of a quasi-Impersonal
Verb 161, 162 (5) a, 234 (2) : Gen-
der 167 : Interrogative 248 : Re-
flexive 253-255 : Article 256-264 :
Relative 265-272 : see *Anaphoric*,
Deictic, *Demonstrative*, *Relative*.
- Pseudo-archaic**, see *Archaic*.
- Purpose**, see *End*.
- Reason**, see *Cause*.
- Reduplication** : Non-Thematic Pre-
sent 16 : Perfect 22, 23 : Thematic
Present 35 : Aorist 36 : T-Class 46 :
Nasal Class 47 : Iterative Class 48 :
I-Class 52, 53 : Intensives 61 :
Future 65 : Primitive Nouns
114.
- Reflexive**, ἐο, &c. 253 : ἑς, ὧς 254 :
use as a general Reflexive Pronoun
255.

- Relative**, $\delta\varsigma \eta \delta$ 265-272 : $\delta \tau\iota\varsigma$, $\delta\varsigma \tau\epsilon$ 108 (2), 266, 272, 332 : δ , $\delta \tau\epsilon$ (Neut.) 269, 270 : the Art. ($\delta \eta \tau\acute{o}$) as a Relative 262 : $\delta \tau\epsilon$ (Masc.) 263 : Correlative Clauses 267 : Omission of the Verb *to be* in Relative Clauses 271 : Attraction 271 : Double Relative Clauses 271 : Final Clauses 282, 304 : Object-Clauses 282, 304 : Conditional Clauses 283, 305.
- Similes** : use of the Aorist 78 (2) : Subj. in Relative Clauses 283 *a* : with $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ and $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \tau\epsilon$ 285 (3) *a* : with $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \delta\tau\epsilon$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \delta\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ 289 (2) *a*.
- Space** : Acc. of 138 : Gen. of 149 : Instrum. of 158 : Acc. of, with Prepositions 183, 187, 191 (3), 199 (3), (4), 203 (2), 210, 212, 215, 218.
- Stem** 2, 9 : Nominal 90, 106, 113, 120 : Pronominal 90, 108 : Variation 6, 12, 22, 25, 31, 32, 106, 114*.
- Subject** 1 : expressed by the Person Ending 2 : by a Noun or Pronoun 131 (2) : unexpressed (vague) 161 : attracted to the Gender of the Predicate 167 : Infinitive as Subject 234 : Acc. with Inf. 237.
- Subjunctive** : form 80-82 : uses 274-298, 362 : history 315-322 : forms in $-\epsilon\omega$, $-\eta\omega$ App. C.
- Substantive** (opp. to *Adjective*) 165 : the substantival Art. 257.
- Suffix** : in Verb-stems 14 : $-\kappa\alpha$ in the Aor. 15 : in the Pf. 22 (9) : $-\nu\eta$, $-\nu\theta$ 17 : Nominal 113 : Primary 114-116 : Variation 114* : Secondary 117-120 : of Comparison 121 : derived from the second part of a Compound 126 *fin*.
- Superlative** 121, 122 : Art. with 260 *b* : with $\delta\acute{\eta}$ 350.
- Supposition** : Opt. of 299 *f* : Opt. with $\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$ or $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ 300 : in Relative Clauses 304 : Clauses with $\epsilon\iota$ 311 : Indicative 323.
- Swearing**, Verbs of, with Fut. Inf. 238 : with $\mu\acute{\eta}$ and the Indic. 358 *b* : with $\mu\acute{\eta}$ and the Inf. 361.
- Synizesis** 378 : in Verbs 57 : Case-forms 105 (2), (3) : $\delta\acute{\eta}$ 350.
- Tenses** 9, 10 : meaning 28, 62, 66, 70-78.
- Thematic Vowel** (ϵ, \omicron) 4 : forms 4, 10, 18, 27, 41, 80, 82, 83 (2), 85 (2).
- Time**, not expressed by the Tense-stem 28, 70 : relative (Impf.) 71, 73, (Aor.) 77, 78 : Acc. of 138 : Dat. of 145 (4) : Gen. of 150 : Adj. of Time in Predicate 165 : Prepositions expressing, $\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$ 195 (3) : $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron$ 203 : $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ 215 : $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ 222 : $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ 223 : $\pi\rho\acute{o}$ 225.
- Transitive**, see *Causative*.
- Trypho** 339.
- Tyrannio** 32 (2), 80, 87 (1).
- Vocative** 92 : Vocatives turned into Nominatives 96, 111 (2) : accent 112 : use 164 : metrical anomaly 387.
- Way** : Adverbs of, in $-\chi\iota$ 109, in $-\eta$ 110 : Dat. of 144 : Instrum. 158.
- Wish** : Opt. 299 : in a Relative Clause 304 : with $\epsilon\iota$, $\epsilon\iota \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon$ 312, 318 : Negative 358.
- Zenodotus** : 2 Dual in $-\tau\eta\nu$ 5 : Voc. of $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\chi\alpha\varsigma$, &c. 91 : $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\varsigma$ (Acc. Pl.) 100 : Dual 173 (2) : Reflexive Pronoun 255 : readings due to loss of *F* 389 : η for $\acute{\alpha}$ App. p. 391 *footn.* : readings, $\acute{\alpha}\phi\iota\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\omicron\nu$ (3 Dual) 5, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\chi\epsilon$ 23 (5), $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\omicron$) 98, $\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\eta\nu$ ($\delta\pi\alpha$) 119, $\kappa\upsilon\nu\sigma\lambda\gamma\mu\acute{o}\nu$ 296, $\delta\eta\tau\omicron$ 378* *b*, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\omicron\varsigma$, $\beta\omicron\nu\gamma\acute{\eta}\iota\epsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\acute{\eta}\delta\eta\eta$, $\kappa\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ ($\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$) App. F (p. 391) : $\acute{\epsilon}\eta\tau\alpha$ App. p. 398.



INDEX III.

CHIEF PASSAGES REFERRED TO.

Iliad.

1. 18 ... § 105 (2)	2. 4 ... 100	59 ... 324 c
20 ... 259 a, 299 b	81 ... 140 (3) b,	98 ... 238
31 ... 136 (1), 151 b	300 c	100 ... 378 g
67 ... 82	119 ... 244 (1)	112 ... 238
89 ... 378* e	148 ... 144	138 ... 260 e
103 ... 181	153 ... 243 (3) b	173 ... 365, 391
106 ... 260 e	179 ... 332	205 ... 367 (1)
111 ... 153	196 ... 255 (1)	215 ... 338, App.
125 ... 262 (1)	228 ... 290, 362	p. 402
167 ... 261 (3)	229 ... 326 (3)	235 ... 170
168 ... 296, 362	234 ... 243 (3) c	244 ... 255 (3)
179 ... 367 (1)	250 ... 210, 300 d (β)	277 ... 164
184 ... 275 a	275 ... 261 (2)	278 ... 173 (1)
203 ... 378 a	285 ... 145 (7) c	287 ... 282
205 ... 275 b, 365 (7)	291 ... 233 n, 243	301 ... 243 (3) d
218 ... 298 (1), 332	(3) c	407 ... 299 b
231 ... 163	302 ... 359 b	415 ... 78
244 ... 269 (3)	303 ... 267 (2) b	4. 18 ... 299 b
250 ... 143	323 ... 76	32 ... 269 (3)
257 ... 151 d	340 ... 299 c	105 ... 147
262 ... 276 a	349 ... 341	142 ... 170
263 ... 271 (1)	353 ... 163	160 ... 316
277 ... 378	356 ... 147 (1)	164 ... 289 (1) b
288 ... 390 (p. 364)	363 ... 158	207 ... 136 (4)
294 ... 136 (3)	367 ... 378* a	243 ... 76
319 ... 262	384 ... 184	247 ... 234 (3)
322 ... 140 (4)	397 ... 289 (2) b (1)	263 ... 308 (1) c
344 ... 306 (1) a,	409 ... 140 (3) b,	264 ... 378 a
326 (3)	267 (3) b	277 ... 332
393 ... 255 (3)	413 ... 241	295 ... 183
406 ... 332	488 ... 276 b, 311	318 ... 299 d
410 ... 151 e	590 ... 147 (1)	353 ... 362
412 ... 269 (3)	669 ... 145 (7) a	357 ... 151 d
453 ... 378* e	686 ... 151 d	382 ... 225
470 ... 151 e	775 ... 170	410 ... 328, 365 (4)
484 ... 212 (4)	811 ... 378	431 ... 182
518 ... 269 (3)	873 ... 167	465 ... 307
541 ... 240	3. 25 ... 292 b, 363	500 ... 192
559 ... 100, 285 (2)	28 ... 238	509 ... 390 (p. 365)
580 ... 324* c	49 ... 170	5. 33 ... 282
	55 ... 261 (2)	46 ... 41, 244 (2)

85 ... 300 c, 304 (2)	29 ... 82	413 ... 78 (1)
135 ... 353	73 ... 145 (6)	414 ... 255 (3)
140 ... 166 (2)	79 ... 241	433 ... 186 (1)
162 ... 243 (3) b	87 ... 275 b	481 ... 295
253 ... 240	197 ... 276 a	493 ... 270
258 ... 292 a, 349	239 ... 233, 262	501 ... 289, 363
265-8 ... 151 e, 271 (1)	247 ... 216	(1) b
271 ... 260 c	290 ... 82	503 ... 170
273 ... 313, 365	305 ... 71 (1)	505 ... 268
303 ... 299 f, 304	342 ... 304 (1) a	525 ... 308 (1) d
331 ... 269 (3)	358 ... 249	527 ... 140 (3) a
349 ... 270	363 ... 72 (2) a	540 ... 141, 390
406 ... 163	375 ... 294, 324* b	(p. 368)
407 ... 305 c	401 ... 267 (2) a	559 ... 260 b
487 ... 170	409 ... 234 (5)	580 ... 151 e
523 ... 150	452 ... 262 (2)	592 ... 262 (3)
566 ... 186 (1)	8. 24 ... 144	608 ... 238
582 ... 151 c	110 ... 326 (3)	647 ... 141
604 ... 162 (3)	111 ... 338	664 ... 72 (2) n. 2
638 ... 267 (3) c	163 ... 226	684 ... 238
682 ... 144	186 ... 173 (1)	701 ... 275 b
702 ... 140 (3) b	219 ... 77, 240	10. 82 ... 162 (3)
715 ... 136 (3)	223 ... 232	101 ... 281 (2)
750 ... 234 (1)	229 ... 267 (2) b	142 ... 269 (2)
757 ... 136 (3)	230 ... 271 (1)	185 ... 158 (5), 216
6. 50 ... 140 (3) b	251 ... 269 (3)	188 ... 243 (3) d
70 ... 141, 326 (2)	378 ... 245 (2)	216 ... 356
87 ... 72 (2)	470 ... 150	240 ... 186 (1)
88 ... 140 (4)	526 ... 390 (p. 367)	247 ... 299 f
92 ... 241	535 ... 140 (3) b,	259 ... 170
117 ... 181	294	330 ... 358 b
126 ... 105 (1), 269	9. 42 ... 235	353 ... 149 (3)
(3)	54 ... 195	361 ... 82
150 ... 140 (3) a,	73 ... 389	398 ... 255 (2)
324* b	88 ... 389	408 ... 260 g
164 ... 299 c	115 ... 136 (2)	416 ... 267 (4)
222 ... 140 (3) a	121 ... 275 a	437 ... 163
225 ... 289, 363 (1) b	133 ... 261 (3)	453 ... { 365 (4)
236 ... 153	141 ... 313	{ 367 (1)
284 ... 245 (1), App.	214 ... 151 e	545 ... 341
p. 401	219 ... 149 (2)	547 ... 163
292 ... 136 (1)	225 ... 378 d	557 ... 299 f
340 ... 275 a	230 ... 231	11. 58 ... 145 (7) c
348 ... 325	245 ... 303 (2)	69 ... 370 (p. 342)
356 ... 378 g	275 ... 261 (3)	100 ... 144
382 ... 324* c	276 ... 340	106 ... 153
396 ... 267 (4)	304 ... 309 a	142 ... 255 (3),
411 ... 240	320 ... 260 e	261 (3)
459 ... 275 b	342 ... 252 (1), 260 g	174 ... 260 c
477 ... 145 (7) d	389 ... 311	187, 202 ... 362 fin.
500 ... 254	394 ... 367 (2)	244 ... 166 (2)
7. 5 ... 362	399 ... 240	350 ... 158 (4)

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 391 ... 292 <i>b</i> | 95 ... 78 (1), 267 | 265 ... 170 |
| 410 ... 340 | (3) <i>a</i> | 281 ... 156, 169, 238 |
| 433 ... 275 <i>b</i> | 108 ... 143 | 343 ... 244 (2) |
| 437 ... 332 | 121 ... 151 <i>e</i> | 371 ... 170, 390 |
| 482 ... 178 | 141 ... 243 (3) <i>d</i> | 433 ... 269 (3) |
| 535 ... 271 | 154 ... 223 | 509 ... 269 (3) |
| 557 ... 186 (1) | 165 ... 293, 298 | 516 ... 143 (3) |
| 657 ... 151 <i>d</i> | 190 ... 340 | 523 ... 390 (p. 364) |
| 691 ... 150 | 221 ... 255 (3) | 531 ... 243 (3) <i>d</i> |
| 697 ... 166 (2) | 235 ... 275 <i>a</i> , 389 | 559 ... 312 |
| 705 ... 390 (p. 369) | 274 ... 260 <i>b</i> | 628 ... 144 |
| 761 ... 147 (2) | 331 ... 324* <i>c</i> | 650 ... 298 |
| 791 ... 299 <i>b</i> | 403 ... 365 | 667 ... 141, 225 |
| 838 ... 162 (5) <i>a</i> , | 437 ... 390 (p. 368) | 688 ... 332 |
| 299 <i>f</i> | 484 ... 82 | 753, 800 ... 254 |
| 12. 28 ... 144 | 15. 18 ... 267 (2) <i>b</i> , | 830 ... 238 |
| 41 ... 82 | 367 (1) | 835 ... 269 (1) |
| 59 ... 326 (4) | 23 ... 298 | 836 ... 332 |
| 213 ... 116 (2) | 33 ... 136 (1) | 17. 42 ... 332, 340 |
| 223 ... 292 <i>a</i> | 41 ... 358 <i>b</i> | 54 ... 390 (p. 366) |
| 302 ... 157, 292 <i>b</i> | 45 ... 299 <i>d</i> | 89 ... 378 |
| 356 ... 82 | 58 ... 240 | 145 ... 262 (3) |
| 374 ... 143, 246 | 70 ... 307 | 155 ... App. p. 401 |
| 407 ... 238 | 87 ... 143 (2) | 207 ... 270 |
| 410 ... 240 | 117 ... 240 | 242 ... 186 (1) |
| 18. 38 ... 245 (1) | 138 ... 255 (3) | 260 ... 170 |
| 53 ... 261 (2) | 162 ... 316 | 372 ... 149 (1) |
| 68 ... 324* <i>c</i> | 197 ... 299 <i>f</i> | 406 ... 258 |
| 96 ... 240 | 209 ... 362 | 451 ... 378* <i>c</i> |
| 107 ... 389 | 256 ... 354 | 587 ... 354 |
| 127 ... 362 | 282 ... 144 | 647 ... 105 (1) |
| 217 ... 145 (7) <i>a</i> | 349 ... 275 <i>a</i> | 655 ... 270* |
| 263 ... 231 (2), 238 | 453 ... 390 (p. 364) | 658 ... 296 |
| 275 ... 140 (3) <i>b</i> | 468 ... 269 (3) | 692 ... 294 |
| 278 ... 394 | 496 ... 240 | 710 ... 338 |
| 285 ... 362 | 539 ... 390 (p. 367) | 18. 134 ... 328 |
| 308 ... 158 (5) | 571 ... 312 | 191 ... 180 (2) |
| 317 ... 240 | 642 ... 139 (2) | 192 ... 248 |
| 353 ... 245 (2) | 709 ... 332 | 194 ... 390 (p. 367) |
| 465 ... 354 | 716 ... 159 | 244 ... 202 |
| 485 ... 116 (2), 312 | 744 ... 136 (4) | 245 ... 236 |
| 545 ... 245 (1) | 16. 17 ... 267 (3) <i>a</i> , | 308 ... 275 <i>b</i> |
| 622 ... 378* <i>d</i> | 340 | 309 ... 63, 244 (3) |
| 649 ... 281 (1), 298 | 31 ... 151 <i>e</i> | 345 ... 141 |
| 667 ... 238 | 35 ... 269 (2) | 362 ... 238 |
| 700 ... 156, 196 | 39 ... 362 | 385 ... 164 |
| 732 ... 78 (2) | 53 ... 260 <i>c</i> | 458 ... 378 |
| 775 ... 324* <i>c</i> | 83 ... 285 (3) <i>a</i> | 467 ... 282 |
| 14. 26 ... 8, 243 (3) <i>d</i> | 129 ... 275 <i>a</i> | 500 ... 356, 361 |
| 71, 72 ... 269 (3) | 200 ... 328 | 506 ... 144 |
| 75 ... 267 (4) | 242 ... 326 (3) | 515 ... 166 (2) |
| 81 ... 267 (2) <i>a</i> | 243 ... 280 | 522 ... 390 (p. 367) |

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 574 ... 151 <i>e</i> | 252 ... 260 <i>f</i> | 413 ... 173 (1) |
| 601 ... 140 (3) <i>b</i> , 294 | 295 ... 158 (1) | 474 ... 332 |
| 604 ... 169 | 323 ... 289 (2) <i>a</i> , 376 | 493 ... 164, 387 |
| 19. 22 ... 361 | 336 ... 304 (1) <i>a</i> | 515 ... 105 (1) |
| 57 ... 269 (3) | 353 ... 271 | 526 ... 324 |
| 73 ... 170 | 360 ... 143, 151 <i>e</i> | 529 ... 138 |
| 88 ... 119, 378 <i>g</i> | 367 ... 158 (2) | 545 ... 270 |
| 124 ... 390 (p. 364) | 399 ... 390 (p. 368) | 556 ... 144 |
| 137 ... 378 <i>e</i> | 411 ... 269 (2) | 592 ... 313 |
| 139 ... 378 <i>a</i> | 412 ... 261 (3) | 622 ... 332 |
| 147 ... 324* <i>b</i> | 421 ... 261 (2) | 639 ... 105 (1) |
| 148 ... 340 | 456 ... 332 | 649 ... 153, 271 (1) |
| 174 ... 255 (3) | 458 ... 196 | 675 ... 326 (3) |
| 176 ... 261 (3), 361 | 467 ... 82 | 730 ... 332 |
| 221 ... 332 | 487 ... 324* <i>b</i> | 735 ... 8 (4) |
| 254 ... 224 | 488 ... 269 (2) | 773 ... 238 |
| 255 ... 157, 252 (4) | 499 ... 171 | 24. 14 ... 309 <i>c</i> |
| 261 ... 358 <i>b</i> , 361 | 562 ... 76 | 28 ... 378 <i>g</i> |
| 321 ... 147, 299 <i>f</i> | 567 ... 324 <i>c</i> , 378 | 52 ... 332 |
| 322, 331 ... 261 (3) | 575 ... 296 | 53 ... 365 |
| 337 ... 267 (2) <i>b</i> , | 576 ... 365 | 74 ... 312 |
| 289 (1) | 596 ... 332 | 154 ... 326 (3), 391 |
| 342 ... 255 (3) | 22. 27 ... 150 | 227 ... 309 <i>a</i> |
| 354 ... 298 | 59 ... 261 (2) | 239 ... 116 (5) |
| 20. 55 ... 262 (4) | 72 ... 240 | 240 ... 269 (2) |
| 77 ... 365 | 110 ... 324 | 296 ... 316 |
| 85 ... 238 | 118, 120 ... 238 | 320 ... 390 (p. 365) |
| 129 ... 316 | 122 ... 76 | 400 ... 196 |
| 131 ... 378* <i>d</i> | 235 ... 238 | 434 ... 378* <i>a</i> |
| 139 ... 316 | 253 ... 300 <i>d</i> | 491 ... 390 (p. 367) |
| 166 ... 289 (2) <i>b</i> , | 300 ... 332 | 550 ... 255 (3) |
| 363 (1) <i>b</i> | 347 ... 390 (p. 368) | 560 ... 238 |
| 178 ... 76 | 404 ... 254 | 586 ... 298 |
| 181 ... 151 <i>f</i> , 260 <i>g</i> | 418 ... 275 <i>a</i> , 293 | 655 ... 275 <i>b</i> |
| 213 ... 324* <i>b</i> | 439 ... 71 (2), 270* | 768 ... 311 |
| 243 ... 285 (3) <i>b</i> | 450 ... 275 <i>a</i> | |
| 301 ... 326 (3) | 459 ... 356 | |
| 306 ... 78 (1) | 505 ... 275 <i>b</i> | |
| 335 ... 326 (1) | 513 ... 356 | |
| 365 ... 238 | 23. 49 ... 390 (p. 364) | |
| 436 ... 294 | 75 ... 261 (3) | |
| 500 ... 271 | 151 ... 299 <i>d</i> | |
| 21. 40 ... 140 (4) | 247 ... 241 | |
| 45 ... 144 | 319 ... 334 (4) | |
| 81 ... 267 (2) <i>b</i> | 325 ... 260 <i>e</i> | |
| 83 ... 238 | 345 ... 282 | |
| 103 ... 282 | 348 ... 260 <i>g</i> | |
| 112 ... 289 (1) <i>a</i> , 363 | 361 ... 140 (3) <i>a</i> | |
| 122 ... 141, 194 | 362 ... 170 | |
| 150 ... 269 (1) | 376 ... 260 <i>g</i> | |
| 236 ... 390 (p. 366) | 379 ... 41, 244 (2) | |
| 248 ... 332 | 392 ... 390 (p. 363) | |

Odyssey.

- | |
|-------------------------|
| 1. 9 ... 143 |
| 24 ... 149 (2), App. |
| p. 401 |
| 37 ... 365 <i>n</i> . |
| 51 ... 163 |
| 71 ... 145 (7) <i>a</i> |
| 110 ... 389 |
| 140 ... 151 <i>e</i> |
| 164 ... 122 |
| 192 ... 290 |
| 204 ... 292 <i>a</i> |
| 226 ... 167, 378 |
| 231 ... 324* |
| 270 ... 326 (4) |
| 273 ... 173 |

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 396 ... 275 <i>b</i> | 211 ... 237 (3) | 221 ... 276 <i>b</i> |
| 402 ... 255 (3),
299 <i>d</i> | 222 ... 309 <i>a</i> | 224 ... 141 |
| 414 ... 311 | 240 ... 276 <i>b</i> | 259 ... 136 (1), 362 |
| 2. 43 ... 282 | 242 ... 267 (3) <i>c</i> | 262 ... 362 |
| 45 ... 269 (1) | 244 ... 253 | 276 ... 162 (3) |
| 46 ... 133 | 247 ... 252 (4) | 286 ... 272 |
| 53 ... 306 (1) <i>a</i> | 269 ... 267 (3) <i>c</i> | 7. 52 ... 311 |
| 60 ... 232, 271 (3) | 300 ... 170 | 77 ... 255 (3) |
| 76 ... 313 | 349 ... 262 (1) | 201 ... 378* <i>d</i> |
| 78 ... 173, 307 | 388 ... 324* <i>b</i> | 211 ... 245 (2) |
| 105 ... 309 <i>c</i> | 389 ... 265, 282 | 224 ... 353 |
| 116 ... 270 | 391 ... 275 <i>b</i> | 261 ... 365 <i>n.</i> |
| 134 ... 261 | 406 ... 116 (1) | 297 ... 136 (2) |
| 171 ... 238 | 478 ... 140 (4) | 300 ... 268 |
| 206 ... 261 | 546 ... 324 | 311 ... 241 |
| 222 ... 275 <i>a</i> | 600 ... 305 <i>d</i> | 316 ... 299 <i>e</i> |
| 227 ... 231 | 643 ... 341 | 8. 23 ... 136 (1), 151 <i>e</i> |
| 274 ... 316 | 646 ... 243 (3) <i>d</i> | 35 } ... 173, App. |
| 311 ... 243 (3) <i>c</i> ,
390 | 649 ... 390 (p. 366) | 48 } ... p. 401 |
| 327 ... 365 <i>n.</i> | 672 ... 82 | 63 ... 71 (1) |
| 351 ... 261 (1), 314 | 678 ... 149 (2) | 78 ... 269 (3) |
| 373 ... 238, 361 | 684 ... 361 | 139 ... 311 |
| 404 ... 149 (3) | 692 ... 170, 275 <i>b</i> | 172 ... 144 |
| 416 ... 209 | 735 ... 299 <i>b</i> | 174 ... 389 |
| 8. 18 ... 275 <i>a</i> | 746 ... 378* <i>e</i> | 186 ... 252 (2) |
| 103 ... 324* | 789 ... 302 <i>b</i> | 267 ... 184 |
| 125 ... 238 | 837 ... 341 | 332 ... 262 |
| 171 ... 200 (3) | 5. 24 ... 326 (4) | 408 ... 164 |
| 182 ... 72 (2) <i>n.</i> <i>i</i> | 34 ... 389 | 435 ... 72 (2) <i>n.</i> <i>i</i> |
| 211 ... 324* | 68 ... 188 (2) | 511 ... 362 |
| 231 ... 299 <i>f</i> | 73 ... 300 <i>c</i> | 526 ... 389 |
| 243 ... 136 (3) | 100 ... 299 <i>f</i> , 390 | 570 ... 300 <i>d</i> |
| 251 ... 149 (1) | 130 ... 188 (2) | 9. 19 ... 144 |
| 270 ... 259 <i>b</i> | 187 ... 361 | 28 ... 255 (3) |
| 319 ... 299 <i>f</i> | 206 ... 255 (3) | 42 ... 143, 390 |
| 321 ... 365 (1) | 216 ... 268 | 68 ... 144 |
| 327 ... 286 | 221 ... 292 <i>a</i> | 102 ... 151 <i>e</i> |
| 363 ... 144 | 224 ... 194 | 177 ... 209 |
| 408 ... 151 <i>e</i> | 300 ... 358 <i>d</i> | 209 ... 210 |
| 445 ... 140 (1) | 340 ... 269 (2) | 225 ... 151 <i>e</i> , 240 |
| 476 ... 149 (3) | 356 ... 269 (3) | 239 ... 149 (2) |
| 4. 19 ... 246 | 361 ... 362 | 257 ... 243 (3) <i>d</i> |
| 41 ... 210 | 471 ... 293 | 334 ... 262 (2) |
| 80 ... 275 <i>b</i> | 484 ... 235 | 405 ... 358 <i>c</i> |
| 110 ... 341 | 489 ... 359 <i>b</i> | 458 ... 243 (3) <i>d</i> |
| 163 ... 326 (3) | 6. 126 ... 275 <i>a</i> | 475 ... 238 |
| 180 ... 325 | 157 ... 243 (3) <i>d</i> | 496 ... 238 |
| 192 ... 255 (3) | 159 ... 283 <i>b</i> | 10. 24 ... 298 |
| 193 ... 299 <i>b</i> | 165 ... 136 (1) | 64 ... 76 |
| 206 ... 269 (1) | 180 ... 255 (3) | 65 ... 298 |
| | 200 ... 358 <i>c</i> | 75 ... 133 |
| | 201 ... 282 | 113 ... 271 (1) |

140 ... 144	263 ... 262 (2)	268 ... 289 (2) <i>a</i>
167 ... 271 (1)	320 ... 255 (3)	293 ... 82
202 ... 348 (2)	340 ... 270*	297 ... 306 <i>a</i>
320 ... 196	362 ... 255 (3)	301 ... 328
434 ... 304 (1) <i>a</i>	376 ... 326 (4)	369 ... 82, 298
495 ... 240	402 ... 306 <i>a</i>	386 ... 299 <i>d</i>
507 ... 275 <i>b</i>	415 ... 338	437 ... 276 <i>a</i>
517 ... 271 (1)	435 ... 166 (2)	447 ... 159
539 ... 282	14. 56 ... 311	17. 6 ... 326 (3)
11. 17 ... 289 (2) <i>b</i> ,	61 ... 260 <i>e</i>	20 ... 235, 271 (3)
363 (2) <i>b</i>	77 ... 144	60 ... 298
25 ... 271 (1)	90 ... 269 (3)	140 ... 262 (1)
61 ... 378* <i>g</i>	97 ... 149 (1)	189 ... 390 (p. 364)
91 ... 166	120 ... 314	218 ... 228, 261 <i>e</i>
161 ... 144	122 ... 299 <i>f</i>	250 ... 306 (1) <i>a</i>
218 ... 289 (2) <i>b</i> ,	147 ... 96	320 } ... 290
365 <i>n</i> .	161 ... 150	323 }
327 ... 153	183 ... 300 <i>d</i>	354 ... 241
328 ... 276 <i>b</i>	206 ... 144	368 ... 248, 304 (2)
443 ... 241	227 ... 262 (2)	373 ... 248
452 ... 151 <i>e</i>	235 ... 261 (2)	375 ... 378
464 ... 341	245 ... 144	418 ... 275 <i>a</i>
519 ... 267 (3) <i>c</i> ,	287 ... 365 <i>n</i> .	423 ... 144
276 <i>b</i>	299 ... 144	454 ... 198 (3)
540 ... 270	328, 329 ... 298, 306 <i>fin</i> .	478 ... 390 (p. 366)
608 ... 244	366 ... 269 (3)	489 ... 243 (3) <i>b</i>
12. 27 ... 149 (2)	367 ... 269 (2)	539 ... 311
64 ... 151 <i>e</i>	422 ... 224	555 ... 243 (3) <i>d</i>
75 ... 167	15. 23 ... 151 <i>d</i>	18. 26 ... 261 (2)
113 ... 261 (2)	24 ... 299 <i>b</i>	107 ... 378* <i>a</i>
156 ... 286, 306 (1) <i>a</i>	80 ... 324* <i>b</i>	114 ... 261 (2)
198 ... 332	98 ... 151 <i>e</i>	141 ... 299 <i>b</i>
243 ... 144	111 ... 255 (3)	194 ... 290
252 ... 260 <i>e</i>	214 ... 238	263 ... 324
331 ... 166 (2)	227 ... 145	307 ... 72 (2) <i>n. i</i>
348 ... 292 <i>a</i>	300 ... 298	318 ... 362 <i>fin</i> .
369 ... App. p. 399	305 ... 302 <i>b</i>	333 ... 261 (2)
375 ... 270	345 ... 283 <i>b</i> , 363	335 ... 282
382 ... 316	(1) <i>b</i>	392 ... 269 (1)
383 ... 275 <i>a</i>	422 ... 283 <i>b</i>	19. 12 ... 82
388 ... 134	423 ... 248, 304 (2)	139 ... 240
428 ... 307	428 ... 332	150 ... 309 <i>c</i>
18. 61 ... 255 (3)	436 ... 365 <i>n</i> .	160 ... 235
78 ... App. p. 401	453 ... 82	215 ... 378* <i>e</i>
86 ... 300 <i>c</i>	16. 70 ... 144	233 ... 271 (1)
101 ... 289 (2) <i>b</i>	74 ... 277, 280	284 ... 240
125 ... 389	92 ... 378* <i>e</i>	297 ... 298
129 ... 269 (3)	138 ... 338	325 ... 338
143 ... 316	140 ... 196	332 ... 363 (1) <i>b</i>
173 ... 238	216 ... 332, 340	367 ... 307
216 ... 358 <i>d</i>	234 ... 82	372 ... 261 (2)
234 ... 340	263 ... 262 (3)	393 ... 136 (1), 262

444 ... 170	115 ... 143, 246	462 ... 299 <i>c</i> , 345
475 ... 236	162 ... 305 <i>d</i>	467 ... 298
511 ... 305 <i>c</i>	173 ... 235	23. 2 ... 245
539 ... 390 (p. 363)	254 ... 152, 269 (3)	135 ... 306 (1) <i>a</i>
573 ... 262 (2)	260 ... 324* <i>b</i>	257 ... 289 (2) <i>a</i>
20. 52 ... 242, 259	294 ... 283 <i>c</i> , 363	24. 29 ... 276 <i>a</i>
83 ... 289 (2) <i>b</i>	(1) <i>b</i>	89 ... 81
138 ... 308 (1) <i>d</i>	395 ... 303 (2),	140 ... 309 <i>c</i>
224 ... 314	358 <i>d</i>	238 ... 341 <i>fin.</i>
242 ... 264	22. 6 ... 294	248 ... 328
295 ... 283 <i>b</i>	36 ... 269 (2)	344 ... 308 (1) <i>c</i>
333 ... 270	98 ... 298	357 ... 255 (3)
348 ... 170	166 ... 277	380 ... 241
383 ... 82, 304 (1) <i>a</i>	176 ... 210	491 ... 281 (2)
21. 20 ... 136 (1)	220 ... 260 <i>b</i>	497 ... 260 <i>g</i>
56 ... 390 (p. 364)	318 ... 390 (p. 368)	532 ... 306 <i>a</i>
108 ... 149	367 ... 281 (2)	544 ... 326 (3)

THE END.

